

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1875.

---

ART. I.—*La Magie chez les Chaldéens et les Origines Accadiennes.* Par FRANÇOIS LENORMANT. Paris, 1874.

THE first chapter of this volume on the magic and sorcery of the Chaldeans contains a translation, so far as translation is possible, of a document printed in cuneiform by Sir Henry Rawlinson and the late Mr. Norris of the British Museum, in their second volume of a collection of the cuneiform inscriptions of Western Asia, issued from the press in 1866. The inscription is copied from a large tablet found in the buried library of Assurbanipal (*Sardanapalus*) in the Royal Palace of Nineveh. It consists of a series of twenty-eight forms of deprecatory incantation against the action of evil demons, diseases, the effects of sorcery, and the principal ills to which men are liable in the course of ordinary life. It has the form of a litany, but was not written for use in public solemnities like the Christian litanies, and, instead of precatory sentences, has successive enumerations of what might be the several subjects of prayer if the composition were a ritual, with one invocatory formula repeated uniformly after each. It is, in reality, a mere collection of incantations, probably meant to be recited occasionally by individuals for dispelling the evils that are specified. These sentences, like others of the kind, were not written in the vernacular language of Chaldea, Babylon, or Nineveh, but in an older language for many ages known only to the learned, just as dead languages are pronounced in some Christian churches even now, and in the synagogues in this case, with a notion that old languages are more holy, and in concession to a common infirmity of ignorance which some-

times venerates what is least intelligible, even though it be no more than an unmeaning spell scrawled upon an amulet, or the muttered charm of a gipsy, on the principle of taking *omne ignotum pro mirifico*.

This language is the Akkadian, written in a very primitive character, and so called from the Akkads, or *mountaineers*, by whom M. Lenormant supposes this writing to have been, in its earliest form, invented. Those mountaineers, believed to have inhabited the elevated plateau south-west of the Caspian Sea, and east of the Tigris, are variously called Turanians, or Tranians, or Medes. The character was afterwards adopted by the Assyrians, and changed from being merely rectilinear to arrow-headed or cuneiform. In course of time, it is supposed, the Akkads migrated southwards to the Persian Gulf, and spoke and wrote their language in Chaldea. That such a migration took place, is the belief of some of the most eminent Assyriologues, but at present the hypothesis of our author lacks entire confirmation. It is difficult to find time enough between the dispersion from Babel and the foundation of Erech (Gen. x. 10) for a party of wanderers from Babel to multiply into a considerable tribe in the wild highlands of Great Media, migrate into Chaldea, mere wild nomads, communicate their language and writing to the Nimrod and his people, and inscribe on the primitive bricks laid in bitumen deep in the massive foundations of that remarkable city the archaic sentences now found thereon. To have accomplished so much the Akkads must have lived and flourished long before Noah and survived the Flood, or Nimrod must have founded "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar" much later than any existing computation will allow; or by another conjecture the Akkads of that remote northern region must have proceeded thence directly from the ark, and carried with them that one speech which all the generation of Noah spoke, and that primitive language must be the very Akkadian which is acknowledged to be older than the Shemitic dialects of Mesopotamia. These are questions for the Assyriologues, speculations to which we cannot commit ourselves, but they are suggested once and again by some views of M. Lenormant, who does not seem to take the Deluge into account in any of his speculations concerning diversities of race. This, however, matters little. He has worked hard on Akkadian inscriptions, and



laboured more than any other man on the dialects of that most ancient language, and of Susiana. He has some profoundly learned fellow-labourers from whose philological researches, aided by the bilingual syllabaries recently discovered, there is much to be expected that will certainly throw light on that remote period of human history. Leaving, then, the Akkadian *origines*, we proceed with the main subject of the book.

Excepting some passages that are lost, in what we will call the Magic Litany, by the abrasion or breaking of the tablet, and one or two not so well fitted for quotation, there is enough in the following selection from twenty-eight sentences to convey a clear idea of the leading features of a religion known to Abram in Ur of the Chaldees. The division of lines is noted (—).

"1. Wicked god, wicked demon,—demon of the desert, demon of the mountain,—demon of the sea, demon of the marsh,—evil genius, huge *Uruku*,—wind bad by itself,—evil demon that seizes the body, that shakes the body.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"2. Demon that possesses the man, demon that possesses the man,—*gigim* that does harm, produced by an evil demon.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"4. That which prevents prosperity, that which is not favourable,—that which makes knots, the ulcer of a bad sort,—the ulcer that eats deep, the ulcer that spreads, the ulcer that gives a stabbing pain, the ulcer . . . .—the ulcer that propagates itself, the malignant ulcer.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"6. He who forges the image, he who enchants,—the ugly face, the blear eye,—the distorted mouth, the stuttering tongue,—the hare-lip, the stammering speech.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"8. The painful fever, the violent fever,—the fever that never leaves a man,—the fever that does not intermit,—the incurable fever, the malignant fever.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"11. Weakness from poison poured into the mouth,—stupor of weakness that cannot be shaken off,—tumour, pustules, falling off of the nails,—purulent eruption, inveterate herpes,—leprosy that covers the skin,—food that reduces a man's body to a skeleton,—food that when eaten is not retained,—liquid that when drunk causes inflation,—deadly poison which . . . . not the earth,—pestilential wind that comes from the desert.

"*Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"12. Frost that hardens the ground,—excess of heat that burns the skin of man,—the bad lot . . . . — that suddenly makes an end of a man,—the bad thirst which serves the spirit of pestilence— . . . .

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"15. He who dies of hunger in prison,—he who dies of thirst in prison,—he who is famishing in a ditch,—he who, for hunger, craves dust to eat,—he who in the earth or the river perishes and dies,—the woman-slave whom her master no more possesses,—the free woman who has no husband,—he who leaves a name of infamy,—he who in his hunger has no means of relief,—he who has fallen sick on an unlucky day.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"16. The god who protects man,—who assures the lengthening of the life of man, that he may strengthen him in light of the sun.—The genius, the favourable colossus, that he may strengthen his head,—for the prolongation of his life.—Never may he depart from him.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"18. Two bands of white stuff, serving for phylacteries,—over the bed laid on the floor,—as a talisman with the right hand if he writes,—two bands of black stuff on the left hand if he writes,—the bad demon, the bad *alal*, the bad *gigim*,—the bad *telal*, the bad god, the bad *maskim*,—the phantom, the spectre, the vampire,—the incubus, the succubus, the servant,—the bad sortilege, the philter, the poison which flows,—that which is painful, that which acts, that which is bad,—their head on his head,—their foot on his foot,—never let them seize him,—never let them return again.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"26. Ninkigal (*infernal goddess*), wife of the god Ninazu,—that she may make him turn his face towards the place where she is,—that the evil demons may come out,—that they may seize on one another.—The favouring demon, the favouring colossus,—let them penetrate into his body.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"27. The god Turtak (*god of the river Tigris*), grand destroyer, supreme layer of snares,—among the gods like the gods of the mountain-tops,—that he penetrate into his head,—for the lengthening of his life,—never may he depart from him.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.*

"28. The man who makes sacrifices,—that pardon and peace may flow for him like brass when it is melted.—The days of this man, may the sun enliven them.—May Silikmulu-khi (*the benevolent god*) eldest son of the ocean,—make sure for him peace and honour.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it."*

But this text, although abounding in material for the study of Chaldean demonology and magic, is very incomplete in comparison with the thousands of tablets which have been brought from the palace of Koyunjik, first by Mr. Layard, and latterly by Mr. George Smith, and deposited in the British Museum: to say nothing of others preserved in the Louvre and elsewhere. Among them there are fragments of a great work on magic, which may yet be recovered and found to occupy about two hundred tablets, which M. Lenormant supposes to have been for Chaldea what the *Atharva Veda* was for India, a kind of secondary sacred book. It contained the litanies, the enchantments, and the hymns of which Diodorus speaks when he says that the Chaldeans endeavoured to drive away the evil and to obtain the good by purifications, sacrifices and charms. These remains are at least ready for publication, and will appear in the forthcoming fourth part of *Cuneiform Inscriptions*. Of these magic tablets there will be more than five hundred published, and some of them are unbroken. Favoured by Sir Henry Rawlinson with proofs of this important publication, our author has produced his volume. The originals of the extensive work which was contained in the two hundred tablets are believed to have been deposited in the famous sacerdotal school of Erech, the sacred city and necropolis of Chaldea. The work was arranged in three sections, as M. Lenormant believes, indicated by three titles, in which he recognises the first, *Book of the Evil Spirits*. There was a second book of incantations for driving away diseases, and a third made up of hymns of supernatural and mysterious power, addressed to certain gods, but different from the hymns properly considered liturgical, and used as such in the official religion of Babylon and Nineveh, some of which also are preserved. The official hymns now referred to may, probably enough, be such as were sung by Belshazzar and his princes when "they drank wine and praised the gods of gold and of silver, of brass and iron, of wood and of stone."

"It is curious to observe," says M. Lenormant, "that the three parts which compose the great magic work of which Sir Henry Rawlinson has discovered corresponding fragments, exactly answer to the three classes of Chaldean doctors whom the book of Daniel enumerates besides the astrologers, the diviners, the khasdim, and the gazrim;

that is to say, the *khartummim*, or *conjurers*, the *hakamim*, or *physicians*, and the *asaphim*, or *theosophs*." But this classification of the doctors of the book of Daniel into conjurers, physicians and theosophs, seems to be altogether arbitrary. *Khasdim*, as we believe, is rightly translated by "Chaldees," certainly not astrologers: however practised in star-gazing many of the Chaldees might be, the patronymic *כַּסְדִּי* or *כַּשְׁדִּי* carries no such meaning. The *Khartummim*, it is almost certain, were sculptors or scribes, who carved figures in relief, or cut inscriptions in marble; but although they often had to engrave amulets or charms, they were not necessarily conjurers. The *hakamim* that are mentioned in the book of Daniel we cannot recognise as physicians, but agree with our learned author when he quotes from Herodotus the statement that in Chaldea and Babylon there were no physicians; and we would much prefer to take *Asoph* for astrologer than for theosoph. M. Lenormant does not profess to be a Biblical expositor; but, skilled as he is in Assyrian, Akkadian, Elamitic and Susian learning, it is gratifying to give him credit for the honesty which is apparent in the following declaration of opinion on an important question. "The more one advances in a knowledge of the cuneiform texts, the more he recognises the necessity of revising the condemnation of the book of Daniel often too prematurely put forth by the exegetic German school. Without doubt the language, full of Greek words in certain places, attests that the final redaction, as we now have it, was later than Alexander. But the substance (*le fond*) is much older; it is impressed with a perfectly distinctive Babylonian character, and the features of the life of the court of Nebuchadnezzar and of his successors have a verity and exactness which could not have been attained had they been written some ages later." This is unquestionably true, and it equally applies to all the books written from Isaiah to Daniel inclusive; but the fancy of a redaction of the book of Daniel after Alexander is utterly inadmissible. In the first place, it is not true that any part of the text, as we have it, is "full of Greek words." Words apparently Greek in their origin are extremely few, chiefly or entirely names of musical instruments, imported from Greece very early, perhaps before the close of the Assyrian empire, or in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, as is clearly shown by Dr. Pusey in his masterly lectures on the book. And as for a literal re-

vision of the text of this book, if undertaken by any, it would have been by Ezra; but for such revision, so far as we can see, there could be no reason, and certainly Ezra would not have barbarised Chaldee or Hebrew words by torturing them into bad Greek, of which language it is not likely that he had learned anything during his sojourn in Babylon.

But it will be more pleasant to meet M. Lenormant again on his own familiar ground. He cites, by way of example, one of the conjurations intended for use in combat with several demons, maladies, and hurtful actions, such as those of the evil eye.

"The pestilence and the fever which depopulate a country,—the sickness . . . which devastates a country, bad for the body, bad for the bowels,—the bad demon, the bad *alal*, the bad *gigin*,—the malefic man, the malefic eye, the malefic mouth, the malefic tongue,—from the man son of his god, that they come out of his body, that they come out of his bowels.

"Of my body they shall never get into possession,—before me never shall they do me hurt, after me never shall they march,—into my house never shall they enter,—my fabric never shall they break through,—in the house where I dwell never shall they enter.

"Spirit of heaven, remember it. Spirit of earth, remember it.

"Spirit of Mulgi (*Bel*) Lord of the countries, remember it.

"Spirit of Nin-gi-lal (*Belit*) Lady of the Countries, remember it.

"Spirit of Nindar (*Adar, god of Saturn*) Mul-gi's mighty warrior, remember it.

"Spirit of Pa-ku (*Nebo, god of Mercury*) Mul-gi's sublime intelligence, remember it.

"Spirit of En-zu-na (*Sin, Moon-god*) Mul-gi's eldest son, remember it.

"Spirit of Jis-khu (*Istar, goddess of Venus*) Lady of Armies, remember it.

"Spirit of Im (*Bin, god of the air*) King whose impetuosity is beneficent, remember it.

"Spirit of Ud (*Samas, the Sun-god*) King of justice, remember it.

"*Spirits Anunna-ge (Anumaki: Assyrian spirits of the earth), great gods, remember it.*"

Among other examples we quote an exorcism of the seven infernal gods called *maskim*, who ranked with the most formidable spirits.

"The Seven, the Seven,—in the deepest of the depth the Seven,—abomination of heaven, the Seven.—They hide in the

deepest of the depth, and in the bowels of the earth.—Neither males nor females,—they are captives at large,—having no wives, and producing no children,—not knowing any order or goodness,—not hearing prayer,—vermin that hide in the mountains,—enemies of the god Hea (*Nuak of the Babylonians?*),—ravagers of the gods,—promoters of trouble, prevailing by violence,—agents of enmity, agents of enmity.

*"Spirit of heaven, remember it."*

A few sentences must be quoted to show the Nature-worship of the Akkads, and assist us in appreciating the influence of their religion in a very important epoch of oriental history. First is a prayer to the Sun.

"O thou who makest lies to vanish, thou who scatterest hurtful influence—of prodigies, of auguries, of unlucky tokens, of dreams, of evil apparitions,—thou who confoundest wicked plots, thou who bringest to ruin men and countries,—who addict themselves to sorceries and crimes, I have been sick before thee,—in the tall ears of grain their images (*of bad spirits*). . .—Let not them arise who work their sorceries and are hardened.—May the great gods who created me take my hand;—O thou who makest my face glad, hold my hand;—hold it, O Lord, light of the universe, the Sun."

Another, preceded by a complaint pronounced by the sick person, and a prayer by the priest.

"The Lord, as for me, I am cast down,—the Lord, great Hea, as for me, I am cast down.— . . .

"Thou, when thou comest, curest the pain of his head;—thou that confirmest peace, actest so, healest his malady.—The man, son of his God, lays before thee his affliction and his fear.— . . . appease his malady.

"O Sun, when I lift up my hands, come to my appeal,—he eats his food, he absorbs his victim, strengthen his hand.—By thine order let him be delivered from his affliction, let him be relieved of his fear;—let him recover from his malady.—Let his king live; to his lord, by thy sublimity, may the days of his life be doubled."

A hymn addressed to the waters that flow on the earth.

"Sublime waters! waters of the Tigris,—waters of the Euphrates, that flow in their channel,—waters that meet in the ocean—Daughters of the Ocean that are seven.—Sublime waters! fructifying waters! brilliant waters; in presence of your father Hea,—in presence of your mother, wife of the great fish,—let him be sublime, let him fructify, let him shine,—let the mischievous and hurtful mouth have no effect!—Amen."



Prayer is also offered to the Ocean, and much prayer to fire.

"Fire (says a hymn), the Lord, who gathereth, raising itself aloft in the land,—hero! Son of the Ocean, who raises himself aloft on the land.—Fire, flashing with lofty flame,—in the abode of darkness thou dost establish light,—prophet of all renown, thou dost fix destiny.—It is thine to mix the copper and the tin;—it is thine to purify the gold and the silver.—Thine is the emanation of the goddess Nin-ka-si;—thou art he who makest the wicked to tremble in the night.

"Of the man, son of his god, may his works be bright with purity!—may he be high as heaven!—may he be fruitful as earth!—may he shine like the midst of heaven!"

None of the prayers in this collection are more worthy of remark than those which represent one of the gods as invested with the office of intercessor. This god, Silik-mulu-khi, was reputed to be most benevolent. There are several incantations or prayers like the following, which was pronounced on occasion of some sick person desiring relief in answer to his intercession.

"Silik-mulu-khi has brought him help;—he has gone to his father Hea in his abode, and has appealed to him: My father, that sickness of the head came out of hell.—On the subject of the evil he (S. m. k.) speaks thus to him: Do the remedy; he (the sick man) submits to the remedy. Hea to his son Silik-mulu-khi has answered:—My son, thou dost not know the remedy; but I will teach thee the remedy.—Silik-mulu-khi, thou dost not know the remedy, but I will teach thee the remedy.—That which I know thou knowest.—Come, my son Silik-mulu-khi.—Take a bucket;—dip out water from the surface of the river.—Touch these waters with thy sublime lip;—by thy sublime breath make them sparkle with purity.— . . . help the man, son of his god;— . . . bind his head.—Let the disease of his head fly off; let the disease of his head be dissipated like the dew-drops of a night.

"May the precept of Hea heal him.

"May Daokina, spouse of Hea, heal him.

"Let Silik-mulu-khi, eldest son of the ocean, form the image that will succour."

It seems evident that, when pronouncing these words, the magician would himself perform the actions prescribed by the god. Pure water dipped from the nearest river might be for bathing the patient, and an image perhaps formed of wax might serve as a talisman to keep up the



delusion of supernatural agency. These examples of demonology, mythology and magic are sufficient to convey some idea of the religion of the Chaldeans under the influence of their teachers from the north, and much more may be found in the volume that lies before us. They were taught to attribute every pain and every mischance to some one or other of an innumerable multitude of evil spirits or gods, and lived in perpetual dread of enemies visible and invisible. They tormented one another by curses, and by the operations of hired sorcerers. Degraded more and more by the unrestrained indulgence of malignant passions, and weakened by abject fear, the trembling slaves of superstition needed prophets of the true God to teach them that the curse causeless could not come, to frustrate the tokens of liars, make diviners mad, turn their wise men backward, and make their knowledge foolish. Good gods and beneficent spirits they were supposed to have, but to their imagination the powers of darkness were at least equal to the powers of light, and their fear of the bad spirits was far greater and more influential than their trust in the good. Sometimes, as in Egypt, the Gentile magician and the Hebrew prophet would enter into open conflict, in which case the issue never could be doubtful, and the worshippers of the powers of nature, of water, fire, winds, or the sun in his majesty, were often taught that the supreme power of the One God could control them all. Yet even amidst the darkness of Chaldean magic there was now and then kindled a gleam of light. Amidst all the moral destitution pictured in the dolorous litany of incantations we just now perused, the image of an intercessor able to prevail with such gods as these were, did slightly mitigate the wretchedness. Even magic the poor Akkad fancied might be made an instrument of mercy. It seems as if a conception was yet bidden to linger in the human mind that hope might come to all, or as if the seed of a better hope with promise of a more sure word of prophecy were implanted from the beginning in the human heart. Or was it a faint echo of the primeval promise of that good which should in some remote futurity prevail? Perhaps man's wild imagination was sometimes permitted unawares to invent, as in dream, pictures of objects that should afterwards be seen in living reality. Such was this: Silik-mulukhi brings help to cure a sickness that came up from hell. He learns in heaven from his father Hea how to purify the

turbid stream, how to heal the sick, and so to dissipate his anguish as the sweet breath of morning dries up the cold dew-drops of the night. So man in the darkest of ages, while yet in deserts never broken up since the first blight of barrenness fell on them, even then and there was visited with hope, and not left without a cheering witness of his God.

We read in these heathen formulas how all nature was thought to be pervaded with disease, calamity, and grief, and we know that the sad idea was not confined to the tracts of country trodden by the Akkad and the Chaldee, but that it has pervaded all the human race, and has even outlived the religions of the world whereof it was once a part. Even among the orders of a European Church we find that of the Exorcist. He is instructed with what charm to drive away the Spirit of the Tempest; to cleanse the seed-corn from the demon that pollutes it, lest the harvest should perish; to drive the bad angel from the nuptial chamber, lest hatred and jealousy should lurk there in the place of love; and to expel Satan from the new-born babe before he can be admitted to the baptismal font. Still the ancient superstition retained the shadow of a truth, and if demons are but personifications of the countless varieties of all-pervading evil, that truth is written impressively in these books of clay.

"North, South, East and West, the vast invasion rages like fire.—They furiously attack the habitations of men.—In the town and in the wide country they smite them all.—They oppress the freeman and the slave.—They rain like hail-storm in heaven and upon the earth. Pitilessly they beat down man and beast."

Passing beyond the circle of Chaldean magic, M. Lenormant gathers examples of demonology from other sources, and in one direction ventures just a step too far. Where the prophet Isaiah foretells the utter desolation of a city, and describes the cormorant, the bittern, the owl and the raven dwelling in it; thorns coming up in the palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses which are to serve as habitations for dragons and courts for owls great owls and screech-owls, and vultures, translators in all languages, not perfectly understanding the zoology of the Old Testament, have been driven to conjecture, and by the imperfection of their renderings have left much room for controversy. Some Jews have taken the word here trans-

lated screech-owl to be an ill demon having great spite against women and children. Our ingenious author shares in the whimsical misapprehension, tells us that even the Prophet Isaiah believed in the existence of the mysterious night-hag *Lilith*, and refers to Isaiah xxxiv. 14. In another place he falls into a far more serious mistake. He speaks of "the admirable refutation of Persian dualism addressed to Cyprus by an unknown prophet, which was inserted among the writings of Isaiah, of which it forms the 45th chapter" (page 197). Such an assertion could scarcely be hazarded by any scholar who had made the Old Testament writings the subject of serious examination. At most it could only be ventured as a juvenile conjecture, and, treating it only as a conjecture, a few words should be sufficient to dispose of it.\*

Let us now accompany our author for two or three pages, and avail ourselves almost exactly of his words:—

"The religion of Babylon, adopted by the Assyrians with one single important modification, was, in its essential principles, and in the spirit which had guided their conceptions, a religion of the same nature as that of Egypt, and all the great religions of paganism in general. You no sooner penetrate within the exterior cell of the more gross polytheism which it had taken from popular superstitions, and rise to the conceptions of a higher order with which it originated, than you find the fundamental notion of a divine unity, but disfigured by the monstrous reveries of pantheism which confounds the creature with the Creator, and transfers the divine being into a *dieu-monde*, of which all the phenomena of nature are manifestations. Below this supreme and only God, since He is the great All, in whom all things are confounded and absorbed, there is arranged, in an order of emanation which corresponds to their order of importance, a people of secondary gods which are no more than His personified attributes and manifesta-

---

\* Should anyone say that an unknown prophet foisted a writing of his own into the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, he may be answered that no true prophet could be guilty of an act impossible for an honest man, and that a false prophet could not succeed in such an attempt. According to M. Lenormant, the cheat was successfully attempted, and an interpolation of what is now an entire chapter, or more, was made in the reign of Cyrus. But in that reign the Jews returned from Babylon, and soon afterwards Ezra and his fellows in Jerusalem republished the Law. It is universally believed that they also collected the Prophets; and the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah had been too earnestly read and were too well and too extensively known to be interpolated with any extraneous writing. If the portion of the Book now referred to had been written by another prophet, there was no reason why it should not have had a place among the minor prophets, whether with or without the name of author.

tions. In these divine but secondary personages, and in their reciprocal nature, are chiefly marked the differences between the principal pagan nations, always under one principle the same. The imagination of the Egyptians, as I have had occasion to say, was always struck with the successive revolutions of the sun in its daily and yearly course. They saw in that the most imposing manifestation of divinity, which best revealed the laws of order in the world, and therein they sought their divine personifications. The Chaldeo-Babylonians, on the contrary, specially addicted to astronomy, read in the general aspect of the sidereal, and, above all, the planetary system, the revelation of the divine being. The Syrophenician peoples, also, with those who professed religions most nearly resembling their own, considered the stars to be the real outward manifestations of the divine Being, and in their religious system they made them out to be the visible appearance of the hypostases which emanate from the substance of the *absolute Being*, whom they identified with the world, his work. Only, under its definite form, their religion classed these emanations according to a philosophic and scientific scale, result of a powerful effort of thought, to which Syria and Phenicia present nothing analogous.

"The supreme God, the first and only principle whence all the other gods are derived, was *Ilu* (in Akkadian *Dingira*) whose name signifies "The God," by excellence. He is the One, and the Good, who, as the Neoplatonist philosophers say, was the common source of all the theology of the Chaldeans; and in fact we find this first principle called 'the One God' in some documents of a very late epoch, when, the philosophic language having been completely formed in the sacerdotal schools, it was said that in the beginning, out of Abyss (*Apen*) and from the primordial sea (*Tamti*), was born the existent Being (*Auw-Kinuv*), adored under this very name by Nabuchodorosor. But this belongs to a philosophical development altogether recent. In the religion of the classic ages of the basin of the Euphrates, the conception of *Ilu* was too comprehensive, too vast to receive any very definite external form, with the consequent adorations of the people. In this point of view the Greeks found in him a certain analogy with their Chronos, to whom they likened him. In Chaldea, it did not appear that any temple had been specially dedicated to him, although Babylon owed him its name of Bab-ilu (in Akkadian *Ka-Dingira*).<sup>\*</sup> During a long time the personality of God was

---

<sup>\*</sup> The highest historical authority says that "therefore the name of it is called Babel because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth (Gen. xi. 9). It seems that very recently a hint has been taken from what is called the *native etymology*, that is to say, the Arabic *Babil*, to depart from the Mosaic account of the name of the city, and to call it *Bab-il*,

not clearly discerned; his office (*rôle*) and his quality of 'One God' were at first ascribed to Anu, 'the oldest of the gods,' first personage of the supreme triad which was subsequently regarded as an emanation of Ilu. The primordial principle of the chief of this triad was not then distinguished, but he was held to be its first emanation. It is only with the Assyrians that the worship of a *Deus exsuperantissimus*, source and first principle whence all the others proceed, takes an importance almost equal to that of Ahuramazda (*Ormazd*) with the Persians, in the person of their national god Assur, from whom the country itself takes its name."—P. 101, *seq.*

Here we leave M. Lenormant to pursue his more congenial and far more successful researches among the tablets. He recognises in those precious remnants of the past the fundamental notion of the Divine Unity, and so adds his testimony to the vast accumulation of historic evidence, but he does not give the slightest intimation that he acknowledges a divine revelation of this truth. He speaks as one convinced that sagacious philosophers have excogitated the doctrine for themselves. He overlooks the historic evidence of a knowledge of God in the world in the earliest ages, the revival of that knowledge on the call of Abraham, and its propagation in Egypt and the East by means of a people who worshipped Him alone, and the infusion of that knowledge into the literature of the West in the age of the Ptolemies. In what he calls the classic ages of the basin of the Euphrates, when the religion of the Hebrews was in the height of its glory in Jerusalem, when the Unity of God was there proclaimed with the utmost possible solemnity, and polytheism and creature-worship were most rigidly forbidden in the very heart of the region which he calls Syrophœnicia, he passes by this elementary fact, and assigns to Assyria the very highest degree of faith, not in one only God, without another, as in Jerusalem, but to a *summus exsuperantissimusque Deorum*: "most high, and far most excellent of gods." It is impossible that the light of divine revelation should be shining in the world without shedding some illumination on the

or "Gate of God." It will not do to play with history and etymology on so faint a shadow of a reason. Twenty-two centuries ago far more competent masters of the subject saw no reason to set themselves above the sacred historian himself, but were careful to translate his words as clearly as language would enable them. Αἰδ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, Σύγχυσις ὅτι ἐκεί συνήχθη Κύριος τὰ χεῖλη πάσης τῆς γῆς. Therefore its name was called CONFUSION.

various systems of early paganism, or that the Creator should have made Himself so gloriously known at the creation without imprinting some character of truth on the primitive societies of men, some image of Himself, which has been distinctly traced and thankfully acknowledged by other eminent students of Oriental archæology, as now partially acknowledged by M. François Lenormant.

But now to the Akkads. It would appear that in the earlier stages of their superstition there was little or no mingling of monotheism in it, and that whatever degree of belief in one supreme God found its way into it came very slowly, and had no perceptible influence on the people. There was, however, a gradual infusion of more exalted ideas concerning a few spiritual beings, as men's perceptions of comparative good and evil became somewhat more distinct, and as differences and contrasts of character were therefore more strongly marked. This conclusion appears to have resulted from study. In the Akkadian religion, where there is mention of the *Amuna*, they are almost always spirits of earth, and the *Igili*, spirits of heaven, and an advancing classification naturally grew out of the doctrine that some spirits were good, and others evil, to whom chiefs were respectively assigned; but those chiefs were scarcely to be called gods, and the existence of one class always implied the counteractive presence of the other. There was no conception of any one created being capable of unmingled goodness, and not opposed by some rival power of evil. To us who also believe that from the creation of the world there has always been somewhere some knowledge of the one true and living God, it may seem incredible that any considerable portion of mankind should have lapsed into ignorance so profound as has now been intimated, and fallen into such a servile dread of evil in all its forms, unmitigated by any adequate conception of godhead. We should be almost provoked to think that this Akkadian scholar might have discovered in his *origines* beginnings of faith in one God coeval with the first productions of those first parents of Chaldean letters and religion.

Yet nothing forbids our accepting this disclosure of the blindness of superstition in what M. Lenormant believes to be the earliest of those magical sentences, before the primitive Turanians had learned to throw them together into the form of ritual. We can believe it all when we



find it recorded in one of the very earliest monuments the world possesses, a monument apparently transmitted across the Deluge by the hand of Noah, just as it was originally bequeathed to their posterity by men of the third generation, that when Enos was born of Seth, son of Adam, "then men began to call upon the name of the Lord," for whether that was an invocation of worship, or a declaration of rebellion, whether mankind had waited without prayer until then, or whether, so soon as then, men began to desecrate the name of the Lord, certainly there was a career of sin, or there was a course of tardy and heartless devotion after that long waiting, so manifest as to make it probable that while as yet there was no form of religion solemnly appointed, there would have already grown up communities of men without any knowledge of a God. The father of the postdiluvian world was probably alive when objurgations like those found written on the tablets now the property of our nation were first stamped in the most ancient known character and language on bricks deposited in Erech, where also were the graves of Chaldean chiefs and priests, the newly-formed archives of their cities, and the first elements of their laws. With these Chaldeans the Akkads, as we are told, came early. It is said that they lived apart from the population, as a separated caste, retaining their own superstition; that they set up no altar, nor built any high place, nor knew the name of any god, in which they differed widely from the Chaldeans, whom the Greeks accounted the first worshippers of God. Their presence, however, was known by their language written, and we now learn their superstition by what they wrote. In order to appreciate the value of these documents we must bear in mind the high antiquity of the place where they were deposited, one of the cities built by Nimrod, who is now believed by high authorities to be the same as Isdubar, hero of the Deluge-tablet, who went in search of Noah (*Hasisadra*). These Deluge-tablets were copied for Assurbanipal, King of Assyria, from an Akkadian original at Erech, and according to the last lines of the eleventh, Isdubar, or Nimrod, returned directly from that journey to his own newly-founded and unfinished city, which confirms the statement in Genesis that Nimrod built Erech.

"And the ship they left by the shore, 20 kaspu (140 miles) they journeyed the stage,



"For 30 kaspu they made the ascent, they came to the midst of Erech Suburi.

"Izdubar also said to him Urhamsi the boatman.

"Ascend Urhamsi over where *the wall of Erech will go*;

"The cylinders\* are scattered, the bricks of its interior also for its mass are not made, and its foundation is not laid to thy height.

"One measure the circuit of the city, one measure of plantations, one measure the boundary of the temple of Nantur, the house of Ishtar;

"Three measures together together the divisions of Erech. . . ."

Here is a complete plan of the foundations of the city, and the proposed appropriation of the ground; but the work is only just begun, and the labours appear to be suspended. Nimrod, as the legend of the Deluge relates, was advanced in age, had been sick and in fear of death, and under that fear had gone to seek for Noah, still living near "the mouth of the rivers," the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris above the Persian Gulf, to ascertain what he had done to gain exemption from death, and to learn what he might himself do to share the same privilege. This very nearly serves to fix the time of the building of this monumental city where the above-quoted writings of the Akkads were originally deposited, and to justify the estimate of their remote antiquity.

Now if the Assyriologues read their bricks aright, of which there can be little doubt, and if we understand them aright, here are the *disjecta membra* of great histories. Until the Deluge tablet was translated we had only some fragments of monuments coeval with the reigns of kings of Israel and Judah, but when this was brought to light it laid open to prospect a far more distant field. Some unknown hand had written a palimpsest, laying fable on a ground of history. As was almost inevitable, the fable had, in places, obliterated the history, but the history was not wholly lost. Now come those writings of the old Akkads, first laid up in Erech, then transcribed and translated, and in transcript and translation brought to the king's library at Koyunjik. Aided by Lenormant, we can read them. Other historic notes are accessible, the whole can be put together, and a new chapter in human history will soon be written.

\* Cylinders to be inscribed with some record of the city and its builder.

† *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, iii. 584.

The mighty hunter of Chaldea welcomes the wizards of the North. The infirmity of age steals upon him. Death approaches. He has heard that the patriarch who rode through the Deluge is rewarded with immortality, and he has gone to ask what he did to make himself immortal; the legend says that he actually resorted to magic ceremonies to recruit his failing powers, and there is a record of the superstitious tale, if not an exact statement of a fact. But beyond all doubt Akkadian superstition was wrought into the common life of Assyria and Babylon, and soldiers too proud to shrink from waging war often quailed in presence of the diviner whose adverse lot forbade them to go up to battle. In Chaldea, however, after the Persian conquest, the national religion was only the idolatry of a people who had received an accession of fetishism from ruder barbarians than themselves; and posterity is interested in learning how their comparatively pure worship was depraved by the admixture. It is well known that the ancient Persians believed in one God, and in that respect they nobly differed from the Medes of whom we have been speaking, and with whom they were sometimes politically associated. The earlier Vedas contain sentences constantly quoted in proof that it was so. The one God whom the ancient Persians adored was good. They made no images, either to worship or use for charms. So far as we know, they practised no enchantment, nor did they objugate any evil power. They were said to hold the faith of Abraham. It appears certain that the theory of a perpetual conflict between two sets of spiritual beings, good and evil, two hostile hierarchies, was introduced among them very gradually, and that the system eventually well known as the Persian dualism, was not officially acknowledged in the Persian empire before the time of Cyrus the Great.

The essential difference between the dualistic Magism of the Akkads and Chaldees, and the faith of Cyrus is clearly pointed out by M. Lenormant, and the amalgamation of the two systems is consequently better understood than it could otherwise have been. The monotheism of Cyrus himself is evident from what is said of him in the books of Isaiah and Ezra. "Thus saith the Lord . . . I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that maketh the earth by myself, that frustrateth the tokens of liars, and maketh diviners mad, and turneth wise men backward,

and maketh their knowledge foolish." "That saith to Cyrus, He is my Shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid," a service which could not have been performed by a worshipper of strange gods, by one who could not have been permitted to enter into the congregation of the Lord. "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden . . . . that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel." "There is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me. . . . I form the light and create darkness: I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." (Isa. xlv. 24, 25, 26—28; xlv. 1, 3, 5—7.) As the Lord acknowledged Cyrus for His servant, shepherd and messenger, and called him His anointed, as king reigning by His authority, so Cyrus for his part declared: "The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem which is in Judah." (Ezra i. 2.) Hence it is evident that at this time Cyrus did not believe in two mutually adverse gods of light and darkness, or, as perhaps an Akkad would say, a god of heaven and a god of earth.

Darius Hystaspis, whose annals we are about to quote, also honoured the God of Daniel as if He were his own, as apparently he considered Him to be, published a decree "concerning the house of God at Jerusalem," and made large provision "that they might offer sacrifices of sweet savours unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king, and of his sons." (Ezra vi. 3, 5, 7—10.)

Darius Hystaspis, being a king of Persia, would be called a Magian even now, if there were not documentary evidence to the contrary; but he puts the matter beyond all doubt by the testimony of his own annals in this standard inscription on the rock at Behistun. It will be remembered that Sir Henry Rawlinson discovered, and with extraordinary efforts and perseverance copied and translated, this inscription. M. Lenormant refers to it, and from his magic tablets, collated with the annals of Darius, we gather more certainly of what religion the kings of Persia were in those days. Throughout the whole of this long document Darius professes earnest devotion to Ahuramazda, the one good god, and to him alone, and in such terms describes the conduct of a Magian who falsely pretended to be the son of Cyrus

the Great, and claimed the throne of Persia, as to show how abhorrent was that man's religion from his own.

"Says Darius the King: Ahuramazda granted me the empire. Ahuramazda brought help to me, so that I gained this empire. By the grace of Ahuramazda I hold this empire.

"Says Darius the King: Afterwards there was a certain man, a Magian, named Gomates. He arose from Pissichada, the mountain named Aracadres, from thence. On the 14th day of the month Vayakhna, then it was that he arose. He thus lied to the State, &c., &c.

"Says Darius the King: The empire which had been taken away from our family, that I recovered. I established it in its place. As it was before, so I made it. *The temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I rebuilt.* The sacred offices of the State, both the religious chaunts and the worship, I restored to the people, which Gomates the Magian had deprived them of. I established the state in its place, both Persia and Media, and the other provinces. As it was before, so I restored what had been taken away. By the grace of Ahuramazda I did this. I arranged so that I established our family in its place. As it was before, so I arranged it, by the grace of Ahuramazda, so that Gomates the Magian could not supersede our family."—*Behistun Inscription*, col. i. pars. 9, 11, 14.

It is certain that Darius did not equally honour Angromanyas, the god of darkness, who is but once obscurely mentioned, although he must have heard of him continually, his worship being the very essence of Magianism, where that strange fellowship of Light and Darkness was the pivot whereon all the system hung. Yet Darius did acknowledge the existence of other gods, but without naming them, which alone would have been to most persons equal with confessing faith in them. But perhaps with latent weakness, paying deference to the Medians, being himself a Mede; and we find him writing in the same inscription, "By the grace of Ahuramazda I have accomplished everything. Ahuramazda brought help to me, and the other gods which are." He does not expressly name any of them, but makes just one stealthy, sweeping concession of honour to them all. It is true that the Persian hatred of idol-worship was uncompromising. Perhaps it culminated in the person of Cambyses, when, in his fury against the gods and sacred animals of Egypt, he stabbed the Bull Apis, but none can wonder that the successor of Cambyses, troubled with rebellions through all his reign, and living under the pressure of reaction, had not sufficient firmness

to resist perpetual temptations to compromise. The standard of public feeling, too, was lowered by the corruption of the older and purer faith, and it was nothing strange that Darius Hystaspis should, in such circumstances, speak approvingly of "other gods that were;" nor was it possible for such a sovereign to dislodge the old idolatries from the mingled population of Babylon when that great city came under his dominion, or to induce the many nations which bowed under the Persian yoke to cast away their peculiar gods. But one cowardly superstition when in various degrees adopted by them all, because originally common to all mankind, was sure to enfeeble every one of them; and that ancient faith in the Good God, of which nothing now remains but a wasting wreck in the Parseeism of Persia and Hindustan, although it once had strong hold on the primitive Chaldeans, now yielded feebly to the naturalistic demonology of the Akkads.

There were some points of resemblance in both, the difference being that in what some call the Zoroastrian religion, which M. Lenormant calls Mazdeism, the good principle was avowedly dominant, while in Magism good and evil were balanced doubtfully. To the Persians Ahuramazda (*Ormazd*) was the only supreme God, the Lord of heaven, the Creator of heaven and earth, although not to be compared with Him whom the once prosperous and powerful Hebrew nation knew as the Father of lights, in whom there is no variability at all, neither shadow of turning. Yet the Persian deity was highly honoured. All the official decrees of kings began with a proclamation of his grandeur. No other god was named. Princes were sovereign by his grace. To him were attributed victory, conquest, health and all prosperity. His law was to be the rule of life. Continual prayer was offered for his protection. Two of their kings had openly proclaimed the god of the Hebrews, in such terms that Ahuramazda might have been identical with him; but Ahuramazda sat on an inferior throne. Instead of being hailed by his worshippers as absolutely the great God, he came to be no more than the *greatest* of gods, and after him "the other gods that were," waited but a little to be released from their comparative obscurity. They "guarded the house," being no more than spirits of his creation, but notwithstanding their inferiority, men called them gods. His only peculiar excellence was that his adversary Angromanyas (*Ahriman*) was to be hated as the father

of all wickedness, eternal enemy of all goodness, whom all men should regard with horror, and load with maledictions, god though he was. Kings were painted as in single combat with him and with his spiritual emissaries in shape of monsters. A name is said to be found for him but once in the inscriptions, and that at Behistun, where Darius for the only time gives it him, but the name is Darauga, "*falsehood*." "The god of lies made them rebel, that they should subvert the empire."

Herodotus and other classic writers correctly show the true spirit of Mazdeism when they represent the Persians as hating idolatry and foreign religions, making war on paganism, burning temples—yet not indiscriminately, for they had temples of their own—breaking images, killing priests, forbidding festivals—yet they had festivals of their own, specially the *Magophagia*, in memory of a great slaughter of the Magians—and violating sepulchres. But it is very noteworthy that Herodotus, when delivering his account of the religion of the Persians, does not mention the name of their chief god, so soon had he been eclipsed by his own creatures, lost behind the guards of his house! He tells, however, very plainly, how they worship the sun, fire, earth, water, air, diminished as it now is into a mere naturalistic superstition, like what we now read of in the recovered books of the Akkads. He says that the Magi were the ministers of this worship, as they probably were in the land of the Chaldees. It is said that the Magi built fire-temples in Persia, as it is probable the Akkads had built fire-temples, or altars at least, upon their native mountains, for the worship of fire had always been a prominent part of their ceremonial. Their sorcerers invoked their god Fire as the driver away of the spirits of mischief, and the giver of joy to life, who struck fear into the wicked, destroyed enemies, dispelled pestilence. That mighty god, Fire, they said, gave quiet to the land, and made the rivers flow gently; before his potent energy the sea was calm, and the mountain-top serene, the hearts of gods and goddesses were untroubled, and their spirits pure. The worshippers among the Magians sang hymns to the ascending flame as, with covered lips, they stood round the altar, that human breath might not pollute it; and households chaunted the praises of the flaming god as they surrounded the domestic hearth. The Magi even pretended to bring fire down from heaven.



So now do the descendants of the pure-minded Cyrus, whose hand the Lord of Israel strengthened, and whom He called by name, join in the same magic circles, and mutter enchantments in presence of the same god, by this time more than half dethroned. Meanwhile the Magians themselves had put away their own barbarous simplicity, multiplied their ceremonies, and received new objects of reverence from other sects. Star-gazing came from Assyrians and Babylonians, and from these latter was adopted adoration of the seven planets, for in that day the astronomer had not gained sight of more. The walls of their strong places at Ecbátana and other cities were built in seven-fold circles, and painted with seven colours, to draw down benign planetary influences, and so the children of ancestors who worshipped one good god only, under the name of Ahuramazda, or that greater name which sat in reverential silence on the lips of ransomed Israelites in the rebuilt House of the God of Abraham, were shamefully brooking the humiliation of praying to the stars. The antagonism of spirits of darkness and spirits of light was transferred from the Scythian magicians to the Persian priests, if indeed antagonism it might now be called. The two gods were regarded as inevitable associates, inasmuch as good and evil were inseparable. The contrary principles were consubstantial, equally proceeding from one pre-existent source. This just repeats a similar example of emanation which occurs in the magical collection of Akkadia, where Mul-ge is at once the parent of hateful demons, like Nam-tar, and beneficent spirits, like Nin-dar. Still there was an essential difference between the altered Magism, and the system which arose in Persia immediately after Darius Hystaspis.

Plutarch relates that the Magi rendered sacrifices to the evil god, *Ἄϊδης* or *Ἀρεμάνιος*, and describes the rites, which consisted in offering a certain herb, moistened with wolf's blood, and laid in a dark place. Human sacrifices were offered at the passage of the Strymon in the march of the Persians to invade Greece. Also at a place called the Nine Ways, they took nine of the youths of the land, and as many of the maidens, and buried them alive on the spot, while the Magi sacrificed white horses to propitiate the stream, accompanying the whole with many magical ceremonies. Herodotus heard that Amestris, wife of Xerxes, a princess entirely under the influence of the Magi,



in her old age buried alive seven pairs of Persian youths, sons of illustrious men, as a thank-offering to the god who was supposed to dwell under the earth. So much did Persia gain from the adoption of Magism, whose devil-worship in the Irak-Adjemy, and north of Mesopotamia, where lies Media Magna, the birth-land of the Akkads, as it now prevails with the Yezidi, is reasonably regarded by M. Oppert as a vestige of the Magism of which we have been writing. It is well to be reminded that the Persians did not retain this horrid custom; but they lost the faith of their fathers; and the annihilation of a religion so near the truth as to be scarcely distinguishable from it by the admission of but one false principle is an admonitory lesson to be thoughtfully received from history.

The work before us opens but one phase of this history, just enough to show that a single pagan superstition, if it be once lodged in any corner of human society, however obscure, may be fostered there for ages, leavening the surrounding mass, that it will increase and canker, eating out all goodness, until it kills true faith, and then, grown more virulent with time, and carried abroad into the world, will corrupt every form of religion in which it is allowed to mingle, destroying in its dupes the sense of ultimate responsibility, and laying the soul prostrate in spiritual and intellectual bondage, to be the prey of guilty terror, the sport of imposture, the slave of immorality. Such was magic with the Chaldees.

---

Art. II.—*Lectures on the Early History of Institutions.*  
By Sir HENRY SUMNER MAINE, K.L.S.I. London.  
1875.

2. *The Senchus Mor; Ancient Laws of Ireland.* Published by Royal Commission. Vols. I. to III. Dublin and London. 1866 to 1879.
3. *On the Rudiments of the Common Law, discoverable in the published portion of the Senchus Mor.* By SAMUEL FERGUSON, Q.C., LL.D. Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy. Vol. XXIV. 1867.
4. *O'Curry's Lectures on Ancient Irish Civilisation.* With Introduction by Professor SULLIVAN of Queen's College, Cork. Williams and Norgate. 1879.

THE notion that Celt and Saxon are wholly and radically different—that the two may be contrasted in every particular, in height, complexion, temperament, and moral character—is certainly not what we arrive at from reading the notices of the two in classical writers. If the Germans are tall, so are the Gauls; if the Germans are light-haired and grey-eyed, so are their neighbours across the Rhine. *Aurea cæsaries ollis et lactea colla* is not merely the loose writing of a poet. *Candidi et rutili*, says Ammianus Marcellinus, of these same Gauls; just as Diodorus spoke of them as λευκοί, ταῖς κόμαις ξανθοί. Livy, too, talks of their "*procera corpora, promissæ et rutilatæ comæ*," reminding us of the old saying on the Yorkshire coast, when a red-haired man made his appearance: "Aw's a Scotchman." Tacitus, the most accurate of writers, specially marks off the Silures from the other inhabitants of Britain *because of their dark hair*, assigning to them, for that and other reasons, a Spanish origin. Further, it is to be noted that the old Irish tales know nothing of dark hair and complexion as distinctive of the race. On the contrary, yellow is the almost universal colour where hair is described—"yellow as the bloom of the sobarehe" (St. John's-wort); and, as Dr. Sullivan remarks, the description of Queen Melb in one of the Irish epics is almost exactly like that of Boadicea in

Tacitus—i.e. as unlike as possible to our modern idea of a "dark little Celt." In physical temperament, again, the two races were alike. The modern Frenchman is supposed to bear heat like a Salamander; his Gaulish ancestor was as impatient of it as his German cousin. Both set their houses, if possible, close to water, that in summer they might live an almost amphibious life; both suffered from the climate of Italy; Livy notes its effect on the "big bodies full of humours" (*fluitantia*) of Brennus' troops. Like similarities in moral character might easily be pointed out; thus, it is the fashion to say that the Germans revered women, the Gauls thought lightly of them. Yet the Gallic marriage-law, cited by Cæsar, gives the woman that control over her own *dot* which the Code Napoléon secures, and which modern English legislation has as yet only partially conceded; while such Gallic tribes as the Arverni had their sacred prophetesses just like the Batavians. Again, years ago, in his Roman history, Dr. Arnold at once accepted Dr. Pritchard's dictum (then so violently contested) that the Celtic and Teutonic languages belong to one common family. "There must," says he, "have been a time when the Keltic and Teutonic languages were parted far less widely than we find them now" (Vol. I. p. 529); "even within historical memory Kelts and Teutons were so confounded together in the eyes of Greeks and Romans as to be regarded only as one great people." Later research has verified this, as it has so many of Dr. Arnold's "guesses." To bring out the substantial identity of Celt and Teuton is one of the objects of Dr. Sullivan's elaborate introduction to O'Curry's lectures. Some will think that in attributing to words like *feud* and *guild* a Gaelic origin the Professor proves too much; but, however this may be, he shows the same similarity in manners and customs between the two races which Sir H. S. Maine and Dr. Ferguson prove to exist in their laws.

After all, then, "Celt and Saxon" are the same at bottom—cousins only twice or thrice removed. They used to be alike in *physique* and in *habits*; and as for language, that changes, especially among uncivilised races, with a rapidity which only the observation of modern travellers makes credible.

This is the modern theory, which counts among its adherents not only Irish antiquarians and English law professors, but physiologists like Mr. Huxley. Some readers

may remember the controversy between him and "a Devonshire man," in which he asserts that the "little dark men" in Cornwall, Wales, the Western Highlands, as well as on the coast of Munster and Connaught, and along the western seaboard of France, are *Basques*, who have somehow lost that tongue to which their Euskarian brethren on both sides of the Pyrenees cling so obstinately. There are difficulties in the way of accepting Mr. Huxley's theory; language, indeed, is no test of race, but surely the shape of the skull is; and other physiologists bring a crushing array of facts to prove that, while the "Celt" is brachycephalic (short-headed), the Basque is, like the old German, dolicocephalic (long-headed).

This Basque difficulty, however, does not affect what Mr. Huxley says about the original identity of Celt and Teuton. Herein he agrees with the classical authorities; for those who think otherwise are almost driven to the clumsy expedient of imagining an extinct Celtic race, quite different from the modern, which fought with Rome and had its portrait drawn by Greek and Roman writers.

Indeed, when we think the matter over, we feel that the antagonism in which French and English, French and Germans, English and Irish, Highlander and Lowlander, have been placed for centuries is, to a considerable extent answerable for their present dissimilarity. For centuries French and English were flying at one another's throats on the smallest provocation. How could either fail to eliminate from its ideal as many as possible of what were deemed the distinctive traits of the others, and so to make the initial unlikeness more and more marked? In Ireland, again, the gulf between "English culture" and "Irish barbarism" was far wider in Elizabeth's than in John's days. During the interval the two nations had been set so continuously in opposition to each other that each developed in its own way, scarcely influencing at all the development of the other. Unfortunately, in the case of England and Ireland, this growing tendency to separation in all that makes a nation's life has been intensified by a variety of causes. We may take Ireland as the representative of the most Celtic, England of the most purely Teutonic element in our islands; this is so, whether or not we hold Mr. Freeman's theory as to the total destructions of the old Britons. But yet it is not through difference of race, it is because the one is Romanist, the other

Protestant; because the one is conquered, the other conqueror; that Irish and English have sundered instead of drawing together. We might easily imagine the same thing happening, under certain conditions, between the northern and southern states of the Union. "Pat" has been John Bull's poor relation; John has been ashamed of him, and Pat has naturally grown indignant, seeing that a good deal of his poverty might be fairly laid to the door of John's ill-treatment. The sudden lifting of Pat into nominal equality in politics by Catholic emancipation intensified this mutual dislike. What is expressed in Lord Lyndhurst's "aliens in blood, religion, and language" became the feeling, not only of the English colony in Ireland, of which his lordship was the mouthpiece, but of the great mass of the British people; while the fierce retort which breathes in John Banim's lines:

"He said that he was not our brother;  
The mongrel, he said what was true;"

shows how "the Celt" resented such very unstatesmanlike expressions. Such feelings between those who, if they were not brothers in blood should at least be brothers in friendship, are on many grounds deplorable. They go far to account for that loss of England's *prestige* which is not only humiliating for the present, but full of danger for the future. While every nation in Europe (Austria scarcely excepted) is drawing together its different members and aiming at complete unity, Great Britain, unhappily, has, till quite lately, been systematically splitting itself into two parts; the weakness consequent on such disunion being worse than anything that would arise even if the Home Rulers succeeded in shifting to College Green the management of Irish sewage and Irish Poor-law details. This is bad; and we therefore hail Sir H. S. Maine's book as a contribution to a better order of things. Adopting Dr. Ferguson's pregnant words: "that it is the duty of those in authority to teach our countrymen the wholesome, social, and political lesson, that all our insular populations have a common inheritance in the Common Law," the Oxford law professor proves that the basis of Gaelic and of English law is the same, that they are different developments of original Aryan principles, that by his law (that "Brehon law" which, ever since the statutes of Kilkenny stigmatised it as "wicked and damnable," English writers

have never been tired of holding up to derision) no less than by his language, "the Celt" proves his title to membership in the great Aryan family. In this way the publication of Sir H. S. Maine's book is nothing less than a national boon. Literature had done its worst; it is now beginning the *amende honorable*. Writers like Sir John Davis and Spenser set the tone of mind in which Tudor England laid its hand to Irish affairs; and the mischief done in our own day by the Froude and Kingsley school of Celt-haters is well known to everyone who has had occasion to study the relations of the two islands. Mr. Froude's last book, indeed (*The English in Ireland*), indirectly wrought much good, for it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the views of his school; and when a man writes the history of a country from its Newgate Calendar, men's sense of fairness is outraged, and they suspect their guide, even though they were otherwise disposed to follow his lead.

Mr. Froude has helped to open the eyes of the English; Sir H. S. Maine gives them something on which to employ their newly enlightened faculties. These "*hypogorillaceous Celts*," as the fantastic rector of Eversley amiably called them, are shown to have "preserved in remarkable purity a body of archaic law, virtually the same as that out of which 'the just and honourable law' of England grew." "The Irish law grew together without legislation on an original body of Aryan customs . . . beyond the limit of the cloud of Roman juridical ideas and the activity of Roman legislation . . . and in the fifth century after Christ these Irish usages began to be stated in writing just as Roman usages began to be written down in the fifth century before Christ."

That is Sir H. Maine's account of the matter; and it settles once for all the position of the Gael among their fellows of Aryan stock. And the recognition of this truth cannot, as he again and again observes, fail to have a salutary social and political effect. Such has been its effect in India, where every white man with the slightest claim to education now knows that he whom some silly persons call "nigger" is of the same branch of the human family with ourselves, nay of that branch which has preserved the most primitive form of the common language. "It helps the magistrate and the collector," says Sir H. S. Maine, "to keep before his eyes this fact of oneness of

origin; and the unexpected way in which the agreement of the Brehon with other bodies of primitive Aryan usage upsets all crude race-theories about the fundamental difference of Celt and Saxon cannot but tend to bring parties in Ireland into harmony."

"Irish ideas," then, are not the ideas of a set of outer barbarians whom English civilisation has for so many centuries been vainly endeavouring to improve off the face of the earth. They are at bottom our own "ideas," formulated by men who are very near of kin to the most Teutonic amongst us. And this is a very practical difference; for, however we may theoretically accept St. Paul's words that "God has made of one blood all the nations that be on the face of the earth," our treatment of negroes and "heathen Chinese" and red Indians is certainly not what we should give to brothers in blood. Nor can it be doubted that "the Irish enemy" would have fared better at our hands had we recognised him at first as our near kinsman.

That we did not do so is, to a certain extent, the fault of the writers of each successive age. The churchmen began it. That unlucky difference about keeping Easter, added to a general indisposition to acquiescence in Papal claims, made Roman churchmen suspicious of the Scotie Church. Perhaps they were jealous of the Church which sent Columbanus and his fellows into parts of the Continent (even of Italy itself) which were fast relapsing into heathenism. The Irish, too, preferred their own church dignitaries to Papal nominees. One of the Brehon rules especially provides that if there be only a psalm-singer of the founder's blood, he is to be appointed head of the monastery in preference to any other better qualified candidate. This is not a high principle of selection, it is the system of family livings pushed to extremes; but we can fancy it was a better plan than the filling up of benefices by the Pope—a plan which in England wholly failed to secure fitting or even resident clergymen. Rome, of course, was indignant; and when St. Malachy, whom the Irish refused to receive as archbishop of Armagh, went over to Clairvaux, his friend St. Bernard fulminated anathemas and abuse against the whole Irish nation. "They are beasts, not men," said the fiery saint, though they did nothing to deserve the title beyond insisting on the appointment of their own chief pastors, being backward in the payment of



Peter's pence, and marrying not according to canon law, but by their own laws, which bear a striking resemblance to the various marriage-laws of the old Romans. This last piece of obstinacy St. Bernard stigmatises as "living in adultery;" shutting his eyes to the fact that *contubernium* and *confarreatio* were true modes of wedlock as well as *connubium*, and that the different kinds of Irish marriage were exact parallels of these Roman usages. This language of St. Bernard told; and the note was soon taken up by the laymen. The literature of England, as far as it dealt with Ireland, did little, for centuries after Henry II.'s invasion, but justify the outrages of the "undertakers," or incite them to fiercer lawlessness. The behaviour of Spaniards and others in the newly-found lands of America taught the English a short method of dealing with aborigines; and it seemed past all bearing that, while distant "Indians" quietly and rapidly melted away before the white man, the unworthy occupiers of a fertile and desirable island close to home should presume to insist on not being "improved off." Here and there an honest man, like Sir John Allen, Irish Master of the Rolls, writing in 1597, says: "the Irish are more conformable to good order than divers of the King's subjects, and keep their troths better;" but it is not too much to say that Tudor statesmen were eager to empty the land of its native population, and to "plant" it with Englishmen, and were only withheld from the attempt (afterwards repeatedly made in Tudor and Stuart times) by its manifest difficulty, coupled with the uncertainty of things in England.\* Enough to show that literature has from the first embittered, instead of soothing, the relations between the two countries. The unpleasant subject might easily be pursued almost to the present day. But, as literature did so much intensify the mischief, so literature has for some time been doing its best to set things right. Students like Goldwin Smith (*Irish History and Irish characteristics*), and Matthew Arnold (*Study of Celtic Literature*), men in active life, like Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, have written and spoken much which English and Irish have taken to heart to the profit of

\* The State papers of Henry VIII. (Ireland) are full of the subject. For instance, vol. ii. p. 176 (Lord Deputy and Council to the King), the *reasons why not* are succinctly given: 1. The land is too large, we could not spare English enough. 2. It would be too hard to extirpate the Irish, they can so *endure misery* more than the inhabitants of any other lands.

both. And now Sir H. S. Maine, speaking *ex cathedra*, tells us that all the talk about "Celt versus Saxon" is a mistake; the two are one, their oldest law-usages prove it irrefragably; and "if the Irish law did not develop as successfully as the English, the impartial historian will by no means admit that the difference is to be accounted for by defects in the Irish character."

We have lingered thus long on what we may term the polemical aspect of Sir H. S. Maine's book, because we feel that the importance of such a book from such a point of view can scarcely be overrated. When we come, by-and-by, to Professor O'Curry as expounded by Dr. Sullivan, we shall have presented to us the picture of a civilisation which may or which may not have existed. That portions of it existed at various times and in different parts of the island is unquestionable; but that the elaborate dream of an Irish over-king, ruling in Temhair (Tara) amid all the pomp and circumstance and with all the gorgeous surroundings with which O'Curry decks him out, was ever fully realised we are certainly not going to maintain. "The King of Erin," says Sir H. S. Maine, "always tended to exist;" and so there might seem to be, now and again, the promise of such high culture as is depicted in the rhapsodies of the bards; but, alas! it rarely bore fruit. The tribal state is not favourable to continuous culture. There was often at Tara and elsewhere store of silk robes and jewelled and enamelled weapons and lap-dogs and chess-boards. The court-ladies in their *grianan* (sunny chamber, the Norman *solar*—*Grian* the sun, *Gryneus* Apollo) were embroidering; the learned clerks were working at those wonderful MSS. which are the despair of modern illuminators;\* the smiths were fabricating those marvels of which the poor remnants so delight us in broken gospel-casket or mutilated crozier. Bards were chanting to their ivory harps the strains which, even in paraphrases like Macpherson's, now touch us with their simplicity, now startle us with their wild grandeur. Brehons were "digesting" law-cases, compiling books like that "book of Aicill," which forms the chief part of vol. iii. of the *Ancient Laws of Ireland*. All seemed to promise well; when "Celtic turbulence, that want of balance and measure and patience," which their friend Mr. M. Arnold

\* *Opus Scoticum* was proverbial through Europe. See what Westlake and Owen Jones say of it.

says is the inherent defect of the Celts, brought about a speedy overthrow. Down went *Rath* and *Grianan*, away scudded the "clerics," carrying into the nearest "round tower" what treasures they could secure from the invaders; and very soon nothing but a charred mass marked what had been the palace of an Irish king.

The circumstances under which the two portions of "the book of Aicill" were composed are "typical." Both are due to violence, acting in one case in direct contravention of law; for the mischief always was, not that the laws were imperfect, but that the sanctions were weak.

The case is so curious and characteristic that it is worth while to transcribe it in full from the preface to the work itself, premising that the date fixed for it by Mr. Whitley Stokes is the ninth century, *i. e.*, some 600 years after the earlier of the two events recorded.

"The place of this book is Aicill, close to Temhair, and its time is the time of Coirpré Lifechair, son of Cormac, and its author is Cormac, and the cause of its writing was the blinding of the eye of Cormac by Ængus Gabhuaidech after the abduction of Sorar's daughter by Cellach, son of Cormac. This Ængus was a champion\* who was avenging a family quarrel in Luighne, and he went into a woman's house there and drank milk by force, and she said: 'it were better for thee to avenge thy kinsman's daughter than to take my meat by force.' So Ængus went forward and reached Temhair (Tara), after sundown. And it was forbidden at Temhair to bring a hero's arms into it after sunset; no arms could be there save the arms which happened to be there. Ængus therefore took the ornamented spear of Cormac down from its rack, and struck Cellach with it and killed him; and its edge grazed one of Cormac's eyes and destroyed it, and in drawing it back out of Cellach its handle struck the chief of the king's household and killed him. And it was forbidden that one with a blemish should be king at Temhair. Cormac, therefore, was sent out to be cured at Aicill, close to Temhair; and Temhair could be seen from Aicill, but Aicill could not be seen from Temhair. And the sovereignty of Erin was given to Cormac's son Coirpré, and in every difficult case of judgment he used to go to ask his father about it; and his father used to say to him: 'my son, that thou mayest know,' and explained to him the exemptions. And at Aicill this book was composed; and Cormac's part of it is wherever occur the words: 'exemption' and 'my son that thou mayest know.' And everything from that out is Cenn-faeladh's.

\* There were seven orders of them for avenging quarrels between families.

..... And the cause of its being composed was that part of his brain was taken out of Cenn-faeladh's head after it had been split at the battle of Magh-rath. And he was brought to be cured to the house of Bricin of Tuam Dreacain (Toom-regan, in Cavan) at the meeting of the three streets between the houses of the three professors. And there were three schools in the town—of literature and law and poetry. And whatever he used to hear rehearsed in the schools by day he had by heart every night; and he put a fine thread of poetry about them and wrote them on slates and tablets and transcribed them into a chalk paper book."

The battle of Magh Rath (Moirá) is historical, and took place A.D. 642; but, whether or not Cormac and Ængus the champion are real characters, the scene described is (as we said) typical, and goes far to explain why the nascent promise of Gaelic culture was not realised. "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel," is the motto of most tribal communities; and circumstances made it more applicable to the native Irish than to any other similar community in Europe. We must not think that such a state of things was peculiar to "the Celt." French history, Carolingian as well as Merovingian, Anglo-Saxon history, are full of instances of it. The tribal nature of the Anglo-Saxon government, the loose way in which the different parts of the so-called Heptarchy held together, account not only for the easy triumph of the Normans after Hastings, but for the small progress which the arts had made in England at the time of the Conquest. The Greeks are to some extent an exception; in spite of bitter wars among themselves, they persistently cultivated the beautiful until their absorption in the Roman empire brought them into a forced unity. Yet, great as the Greeks were in arts and letters, we cannot but feel they were kept back by their internal quarrels from much in which they might else have excelled. But for these, they would doubtless have been great in physics also; and, even as they are unsurpassed in poetry and sculpture, so they would have anticipated our scientific discoveries and antedated by many centuries the progress of the world.

Ireland had both evils to contend with, tribal quarrels and (what Greece was long free from) successful foreign invasion. The coming in of the Norsemen, more ruinous than it was even in England, followed too soon on the civilising impulse given by Christianity. There are great excuses to be made for her having dropped behind in the

race (she has no coal, for instance; and unhappily her people took to growing the potato, "that soul-degrading root," as Cobbett calls it). But nations, like individuals, are judged by results, not by promises of excellence; and it is futile in the Irishman to be always coming forward and saying: "See what we were before you came amongst us with your wars and your destructions; and thence gather what we should have been, had you but left us alone." That England and Ireland are what they are is the result of a number of complex causes which it would puzzle a Buckle to unravel and classify. What they will be, what Great Britain is to be, depends on how they "pull together" for the future, how the solidity of the Englishman is helped by the vivacious *elan* of the Irishman, and the instability of the Irishman supported by the steadiness and "bottom" of the Englishman. And this "pulling together" may be wonderfully helped by a wholesome study of the past. We have had far too much about the faults on both sides; English misrule and Irish petulance have both been set forth with an eloquence worthy of a better cause. It is time to leave such unprofitable recriminations, and to study what the early state of Ireland really was. And the study will be profitable; for it will show that both in law and in general culture the Gael were, in the earliest times, at least our equals, having preserved in unusual purity the notions of justice, the usages in reference to land-tenure, the poetical ideas, and the arts of ornamentation which the Aryan family seems to have possessed before its dispersion. To such a study there cannot be better helps than the authors whom we have named at the head of this paper. It remains for us to point out a little more in detail what the reader is to expect in books which it will be his chief wisdom to consult for himself.

To Dr. Ferguson, better known to the English reader as the author of *Come, see the Dolphin's anchor forged*, and other deservedly popular ballads, than as a law writer, belongs the honour of having first pointed out the fact that the germs of the English Common Law are discoverable in the Brehon code. Such a discovery was, indeed, inevitable as soon as any considerable part of the Brehon code was published. That publication began in 1865, under the direction of a Government Commission issued in 1852; the work being mainly done by O'Donovan and O'Curry—both of whom died before the portion hitherto

published was completed. This *Senchus Mor* (great body-of-law) has been already analysed in the pages of this REVIEW, and its testimony to the early civilisation of Ireland set forth. The publication was (report says) taken in hand by order of the late Prince Consort, who had the matter forced on him by Zeuss and the other Celtic scholars of Germany. Irish energy, unfortunately, spends itself in other directions; and Irish wealth has always been most niggard in the support which it has given to the study of Irish antiquities. The *Revue Celtique* sometimes comments severely on this want of true national feeling, contrasting it with the literary activity displayed by little nationalities like Servians and Croatians. The contrast is scarcely a fair one. Ireland has no Turkey to keep patriotism at fever heat, nor has it any Russia to maintain from interested motives a moribund dialect in fictitious life. Still the charge is too true that "the Irish societies which devote themselves to the national literature and antiquities die through the indifference of the public, or only escape death by amalgamation." No one can seriously hope to revive the use of the Gaelic speech; but it is a disgrace that the Celtic professorship in the four Queen's colleges should have been suppressed for lack of pupils. M. Gaidoz says (*Rev. Celt.*) that when he was in Dublin he went to the class of Mr. O'Mahony, Celtic Professor in Trinity College, and found that he was in for a *tête-à-tête* with his teacher. But now that, in spite of public indifference, the remnants of Irish law have been in part published; now that Sir H. S. Maine has called attention to their value as illustrating the early history of institutions, the work must not be suffered to stop. Professor Maine points out that in the unpublished parts of the Irish code we may suspect not traces merely, but evidence of legislation, as distinct from the mere registering of usages; and surely such evidence would be far more valuable than some of the monkish chronicles published in our English Rolls' series.

Dr. Ferguson, with true legal instinct, at once seized on the resemblance between the Irish *law of distress* and the *distrainment* allowed under English common law. The Irish method was more archaic than the English, inasmuch as it provided that before distraining on a debtor of superior rank the creditor must *fast upon him*, just as the Hindoo creditor "*sits dharna*" at his debtor's door, unless he pre-



fers to hire a Brahmin to do it for him. It was also more reasonable, for it provided that, after due "stay," the distress might be sold, whereas, till quite recently, the English law made no such provision. Again, whereas the English Common Law practically permits distraint after simple demand of payment without notice of intent to distraint, the Irish procedure was by steps exactly answering to those on which our Common Law insists in theory, viz., summons, attachment and distress. The distinction, too, between *nam* (Germ. *nehmen*) the original seizure, and *witherman* (*wieder, nahm*) the second seizure, is exactly preserved in *gabhail* and *athgabhail*. Replevin, too, the antidote to restraint, has its parallel in old Irish use. These and other resemblances, and the general likeness of old Irish land tenure, as described by Sir John Davis (1607), to "the custom of gavelkind" Dr. Ferguson explains by assuming that old British institutions underlie our English laws, just as many who have not the fear of Mr. Freeman before their eyes venture to imagine that a Celtic strain is mingled with our English blood. Sir H. Maine, on the other hand, attributes the resemblance to the survival even in our much altered society of some remnants of primitive Aryan usage.

There are traces among us not only of pre-feudal land-tenure but of the state when land was held in collective ownership by groups of men united, or believing themselves united, by blood relationship. Nasse showed this with more than German acuteness in his "Land Communities of the Middle Ages." Sir H. Maine treats of it at length in his former book on "village communities." This collective ownership, still to a great extent the rule in Slavonic communities (see M. Laveleye's *Formes Primitives de la Propriété*) continued in full force among the Gael down to the time of the English invasion. In England, meanwhile, conquest and reconquest and the coming in of feudalism had gone far to destroy this primitive usage, so that the English invaders found themselves face to face with usages which had been indeed those of their forefathers but which they had wholly forgotten. The standard of value, too, had changed in the more advanced country. In primitive times land is a drug; the nomad sets little store by it, the hunter will recklessly barter it for food or drink. Even in settled groups, like the existing village communities of Hindostan or Russia, it is a very long time

before land gets the high consideration which it has in countries like our own. The thing is not to own the land, but to be able to till it. Hence the pre-eminent value of the ox; among the Hindoos he becomes a sacred thing, the old Romans class him, along with women, children, and slaves, among the *res Mancipi*, things that could not be sold like a pound of cheese or a barrel of wine. Among the old Irish the same feeling of their value caused the fines for which all offences were commuted to be reckoned in cattle. Hence fining a rebel by stripping him of his land was a new thing and was naturally felt to be a grievance. Primogeniture, too, which, of course, became the law within the English pale, was as novel and unpleasant to the Irish as it would be to the members of a Hindoo joint-family, or to the *cumpani* of an old French community of villeins, or, again, to the inhabitants of a Russian *mir* or of an old German mark.

Hence the two systems never affected each other; the Irish went on living by Brehon rule—Spenser describes their gatherings on hill-sides to get their disputes settled by their chiefs through their brehons or judges. Even after its formal abrogation, early in James I.'s reign, the old law still kept its hold on Irish feeling. The memory of it accounts for a great deal of that indisposition to obey the law which nowadays so puzzles the impartial observer in the case of a people whom writers of the 16th and 17th centuries characterize as singularly law-abiding and fond of justice. As Sir H. Maine says: "it was a great mistake and a great wrong this entire judicial and legislative abolition of Irish customs;" it is, we may remark, what even the cruellest conquerors have never thought of doing; it is what we do not attempt to do even in countries like British Caffraria.

This necessary antagonism led to a systematic undervaluing of the Irish code; "wicked and damnable," says the statute of Kilkenny; "lewd and unreasonable," says Sir J. Davis; "having a great shew of equity, but in many things repugning quite both to God's law and man's," says Spenser. It led, too, to an ignoring of those parts of Irish law which were more consonant with English use; the determination being to abolish the Irish code *in toto*, English lawyers seized on and held up to ridicule those parts of it which seemed strangest. From Sir J. Davis and all the writers of his class we might imagine that private pro-

perty in land was a thing unknown among the Gael; they are never tired of pointing out the barbarism of "tanistry" and "Irish gavelkind." On the contrary, we find from these published portions of the old law that private property existed from very early times. The law of contracts and inheritance does not seem to have been understood before Christianity came in—the *Corus Bescna*, which deals with this subject, was probably written with the view of facilitating and encouraging gifts of land to the Church; but the chief always had his private domain, as representative of the purest blood of the common ancestor, and his powers over the waste land of the tribe (the *ager publicus*, the outlying and unoccupied districts) was great and increasing. Feudalism, in fact, was (as Sir H. Maine points out) growing up among the Gael, for the same reasons for which it grew up among the Teutons of the Continent and their brethren in England. The tribal state is a state of war, and war is sure to create a number of "broken men"—fugitives, remnants of some conquered tribe, and such like. In the ideal state, when there is peace between all the tribes, the lot of such men is very hard. When "the dogs of your own tribe are more near of kin to you than the men of another," a stranger stands a poor chance. But in troublous times it is quite otherwise. A strong arm is valuable then; and though he who wields it cannot be admitted into so close a community as a sept, he may be placed among the outliers of the clan, having land assigned to him on its borders, and "taking stock" (receiving a loan of cattle, tantamount to becoming vassal) from the only man who always had spare cattle, viz., the chief. Such a tenant-at-will, gradually becoming actual vassal of the chief, is called in the Brehon code a *fuidhir*. It is the system of *beneficium* (giving a grant), and *commendatio* (putting oneself under a superior lord) over again. The "stock-taker" became the *caille*, gillie, vassal of the chief, for, indeed, this relation of lord and vassal, patron and client, is deeply seated in rudimentary Aryan usages; and we need not seek the origin of feudalism in the Roman custom of making grants to Riparian veterans. From Cæsar we see that it was growing up in Celtic Gaul, and the Brehon laws enable us to trace its spontaneous development in Celtic Ireland. Had Ireland remained free from foreign interference, feudalism would in time have grown up there as strongly as it did in England before and

after the Norman Conquest. During the troubles of the Norse inroads the custom (reprehended by the Brehon lawyers) of *forcing* all tribesmen to "take stock" crept in. Inferior chiefs, too, "took stock" of higher chiefs; till by-and-by the phrase came to signify a confession of dependence. Thus, in a gloss on the laws of "stock giving"—"stock is given to the king of Erin, by the king of the Romans, or by the successor of Patrick."\*

The Brehon judges tried to introduce equity into what tended to become an oppressive system; they limited the amount of stock which a man could be forced to take (on this amount depended the degree of his subserviency, and the amount of refection—Spenser's "coyn and livery"—which he was called on to provide for the chief). "He brings in *fuadhirs* to increase his rent," is one of their dicta; and on the whole, though they recognise in certain cases personal property in land, they strongly disapprove of this multiplication of tenants at will which, beginning before the English invasion, vastly increased during the long troubles that followed. Had Ireland been left alone, things would have righted themselves, as they more or less did elsewhere in Europe. One tribe would have mastered the rest. A strong central government, impossible under the purely tribal system, would have been set up; feudalism would have been organised round one instead of round many centres: the legal ideas which come from such a government would have come into the Brehon law, and (in Sir H. Maine's words) "the gap, never very wide, between 'English civilization' and 'Irish barbarism' would have disappeared." This was not to be; English centralisation battered down the loose fabric of the clans; the brehons with their law-schools died out, their last representatives being the miserable broken-hearted wanderers who were to be met with at the end of the seventeenth century, hiding under their tattered friezes the books which were dearer to them than life, and to be found possessed of which was sure to bring them into trouble with the new lords of the land. These men, to some of whom Sir James Ware flung the crumbs of his contemptuous bounty, while getting from them all that he wanted for his *Collectanea Hibernica*, were the last of the brehons; just as the poor fellow who sells his own verses at an Irish country fair represents, for these

---

\* *Senchus Mor*, ii. p. 225.

degenerate days, the "bard and satirist" of primitive times; just as Scott's *Gabelunzie* was the last survivor of the Scottish minstrel.

"There is scarcely a doubt," says Sir H. Maine, "that the brehons were the descendants of the Druids." We are glad to find that the reaction against Sir G. C. Lewis and the party who denied that the Druid was ever anything more than an isolated medicine-man, is setting in strong, and that such a clear-headed observer as the Oxford law-professor goes with it. As he well remarks, what Cæsar tells us about the Druids must in the main be true. They were not travellers' tales, like his stories about the elks; he was living amongst men who saw Druids much oftener than we see bishops; and he had no reason for "evolving" such a picture, even had it been possible for him to do so. It is Pliny, with his rage for anecdote, who has discredited the Druids. They were judges as well as priests among the Celts; and this is remarkable, for in Early Greece the chief, though he had mostly ceased to be priest, was still judge. By-and-by the judicial authority passed in most Greek states to the popular assembly; in Celtic states it was for a time vested in the priest, and then (in Sir H. Maine's words) "Themis set up for herself," the judgeship became hereditary and distinct from the priesthood (this seems to have been the case in Ireland even before Christianity came in); and the curious institution of law-schools, reminding us of Cæsar's schools of the Druids, grew up. In these schools existed in full force the strange custom of "literary fosterage," found at the present day at the other end of the Aryan world between the Brahmin teacher and his Brahmin pupils. He receives no pay, but he is looked on as their kinsman, and stands in remote succession to their property, the laws of Menu say: in default of kindred it goes to the preceptor.

What were the sanctions whereby, in a state of society mostly far from settled, the brehon was able to enforce his judgments? Originally, as the custom of "fasting on the debtor" shows, the judge must have been able to throw some supernatural sanction round his decrees. By-and-by obedience doubtless became more and more voluntary; it was so (says Sohm) in the case of the Frankish code; and when, under pressure of English invasion, "the strong hand" became the chief power in Ireland, the brehon could expect little beyond

moral support. He never seems to have been taken up by, nor to have made common cause with, the churchmen. Tradition, indeed, giving the origin of the *Senchus Mor*, says that St. Patrick soon after his arrival examined it and pronounced "the law of nature" quite right, except in matters of faith. "The Spirit of God had spoken by the early brehons and judges of Erin." The saint gave his authority to the code, round which Dubhthach, chief poet of Erin, "threw a thread of poetry for Patrick." But the influence of the Church (except on the law of contracts) seems to have been very slight. The marriage laws, as we remarked in speaking of St. Bernard, remained what they were—based on primitive usage and not on canon law. Priest and brehon, then, appear to have stood apart. The yet published portions of the code throw no light on the gradual change whereby the headship of the Irish Church passed from "the successor of Patrick" to the Pope, though some of the most modern glosses assume this as having already come about. "The authority of the Brehon code was due (says Sir H. Maine) first to the obstinate vitality of all customs observed by 'corporate natural groups,' next to the bold and never-flagging self-assertion of the expounders. We can scarcely form an idea of the vast power, in early societies, of the class which formulates the dim ideas of the multitude, which can say: 'so have the learned laid down,' or 'so it is written.'" Such being the lawyers, what of their law-books? They are certainly not easy reading; not what one would take up if one wished in a pleasant way to get a general notion of old Irish society. Here and there indeed is a wild legend illustrating some case in law; here and there a scrap of very old verse (a fragment of Dubhthach's "thread of poetry") imbedded in glosses of various dates; and these glosses are of every kind, relevant and irrelevant, sensible and nonsensical, really helpful, and wholly contradicting the text. The Editors (preface, vol. iii.) compare the *Senchus* to "the worst kind of English law-books, without index or alphabetical arrangement." And yet it is to this chaos of facts that he will go who is really anxious to see how men and women lived in Ireland before the days of the invasion. The books bear the stamp of genuineness, of being true to the circumstances of daily life, much more than the somewhat similar but more formulated Welsh laws of Howell the Good. As the Editors remark: "the defect of system,



the tendency to look to individual cases and not to principles, is an advantage, for it forced them to describe every form of society, and especially the ordinary life of the people." Here then we have an unworked mine which should give good results. In the poems and tales from which O'Curry gets his characteristics of Irish civilisation, there is always the doubt, how far the poet is not merely transferring to an earlier time the culture of his own day, but inventing instead of describing, telling us what ought to have been instead of what was. This doubt weakens the force of a good deal of Mr. Gladstone's "Homeric studies;" we cannot, for instance, be sure that the chieftains of Homer's time lived in splendid palaces because Menelaus's house is described in the *Odyssey* as rich in gilding and carved work. But in a law-tract there is no such temptation to exaggerate. We may, therefore, accept the text of the *Senchus* as evidence of how life went on in Ireland in the days when "old Irish" (that form which had come to need a glossary in Cormac's day, A.D. 827) was used, while the glosses bring us gradually on to the date of the existing transcripts—the earlier half of the fourteenth century. The idea we form is (as was said above) of a society less wanting in culture (carrying culture in some points to excess) than in stability. Sir H. Maine, indeed, denies that the Brehon code is "a legislative structure, it is the creation of a set of professional lawyers." From this it follows that in several instances it is more "modern" in spirit than similar English statutes of much more recent date. We have seen something of this in regard to the law of distress. We may add that the very modern subjects of "Contributory negligence," and "Measure of damages," are dealt with in these tracts. Here and there, indeed, the "cases" are childish to the point of absurdity. When it is gravely laid down (book of Aicill, p. 557) that "the cat is exempt from liability for eating the food which it finds in the kitchen, but compensation is due from the person who was ordered to mind it," and when again it is ruled that the cat is not answerable for injuring an idler while mousing; and only half-fine is due from pussy for injuring even a profitable worker, the other half the excitement of his mousing takes off from him," we feel that Sir H. Maine is justified in supposing that we have not before us "the laws of Erin," but the school-exercises wherewith the Brehons sharpened the wits of their scholars. But this

does not affect the truthfulness to daily life of the details and illustrations, nay, it is rather an additional warrant of that truthfulness. Let us hope that ere long some Irish writer will, with the Brehon law-books as his authority, give us a sober, accurate picture of life in Ireland, if not in the days before St. Patrick, at any rate at the time when Cormac was building at Cashel and "Malachy wore his collar of gold."

Sir H. Maine does not in this volume of lectures confine himself to the Brehon law; taking his text from it he traces most lucidly the gradual coming in of property in land—how it arose, first from the disentanglement of individual rights from the collective rights of the tribe (still seen in our socage tenures), next from the growth and transmutation of the tribal chief's sovereignty—the change from chief into feudal lord. The modern theories of sovereignty (in Bentham and Austin's sense) and of land as a commodity are of course newer still; they come from the break-up not only of the village groups but of the feudalism which displaced the old relations between chief and tribesman. Sir H. Maine summarises somewhat thus: "Kinship is the basis of primitive Aryan society; but, when the tribe settles, land becomes the basis. An Indian poetess compares the invasion of a tribe to the flowing of sugar-cane juice over a flat surface; it crystallises in detached lumps—these are the village communities . . . . The history of the larger kin-groups ends in the modern notions of country and sovereignty, the history of the smaller in the modern notions of landed property."

We must not suppose that because there was very little distinct ownership in the old tribe (a Hindoo joint-family are found *claiming shares in the earnings of a dancing-girl who was a member of it*), therefore it was a democratic society. On the contrary, it was intensely aristocratic, and wealth had in it a higher place, if possible, than it has among us. There is no such thing as natural communism, and a society so little removed from "the original patriarchal cell" was sure to retain full reverence for its head. One element of distinction, indeed, was lacking; there being no trace of conquest the chief looked on himself as being of the same blood as his tribesman, nearest of kin to him who was the assumed forefather of all. Hugh O'Neil, Prince of Tyrone among the Irish, Baron Dungannon in the English peerage, shared with his horse-boys the name

and the kinship to the mythical ancestor. To a mediæval baron, on the other hand, it would have been the greatest insult to assume that he was of the same race as his villeins. For that very reason, wealth told more in Celtic society than in mixed communities of mediæval Europe. The opposition between wealth and birth dates only from the times of the French farmers-general of taxes. The Celtic chief, expected to keep open house, to bestow continual gifts on hosts of poets and satirists, to have "stock" for any number of *fuidhirs*, was bound to be a man of substance. If cattle ran short he must increase them by a successful foray, or he would soon lose all consideration in the eyes of his tribe. There is even a provision by which wealth tells without birth. If a common man, by "taking stock" or otherwise, made himself doubly as rich as the *aire-desa* or chief of the lowest rank, he became a *bo-aire* (cow-nobleman), and if he kept up his income during seven years he rose to the rank of *aire-desa*. Still, though wealth told, the tribesman was far superior in position to the modern tenant. He fell into the sad state of the Irish peasant because when the Irish chiefs surrendered their tribes' lands and received them again in *demesne*, with an English title, no care was taken of the sept, the government dealt with the chief only, just as if the rest had had no rights and no interest in the matter.

Well; we trust what has been said will do something to correct what Sir H. Maine calls "those reckless race-theories which assert an inherent difference of idea and usage between Celt and Teuton."

The Irish tribe-land is the German *mark*; the traces of joint-holding are seen in our English *lammas lands* and in other still-existing customs. The *udale* tenures which Sir W. Scott tells us, in the notes to the *Pirate*, he found in use among the Norse folk of Orkney and Shetland are the same substantially as those of the old Gael. Celt, Teuton, and Scandinavian are all proved by their primitive laws and customs to be branches of the same Aryan stock.

And now for a few brief notes from O'Curry's "lectures"—that O'Curry whom Mr. Matthew Arnold happily calls "the obscure Scaliger of a despised literature." We may note in passing that the Lectures were delivered at the "Catholic" University in Dublin, and that Dr. J. H. Newman contributed largely towards the costly researches on which they are based. Strangely *irregular* is the civilisa-

tion which they describe; the Fianna, for instance, chosen champions to keep off invaders, they after whom the Fenians are named, must all be good poets as well as skilled in "reading the twelve books of poetry," at the same time that they cooked their food with red-hot stones after the fashion of the New Zealanders. So, again, while some heroes have shields so sensitive that they groan when danger threatens the wearer ("Fergus's shield groaned, and all the Ulster shields groaned with it"), the old Irish seem to have been far below the Danes in the matter of defensive armour. Nor are bows and arrows mentioned in any old document, nor battle-axes; slings were rare, the chief missile being a small shield like an unperforated quoit. Their kings divided their time, though not exactly by Alfred's rule; "one third of the day was devoted to superintending the ball-play and other games of the nobles (the "hurling" still played among the Basques, and in Cornwall at St. Colomb and St. Ives), another third to draughts and chess, the rest to eating and drinking, till sleep seizes them, professors of music and amusement, tumblers and jugglers with their balls, &c., playing meanwhile." This does not betoken high culture; and yet it is the way in which many modern princes, civilized and Christian, have spent their time. About the music heard at these feasts there has been much discussion; the reader who cares to pursue a very interesting but difficult subject will find it exhaustively treated of in Dr. Sullivan's *Introduction*. It is a pity that this portion of the work, so much more likely to prove of general interest than the remainder should not be reprinted in a separate form. Old Irish music has been terribly disfigured. The keys very seldom agree with those of modern music; the scale is gapped, like the old Scotch and the Chinese. Hence transcribers constantly change the notes and put in modern flats and sharps, majors and minors. That the Irish tunes owe much to the old Church music which taught them the diatonic scale is, doubtless, true, yet there is in them a rich treasure of original melody, which it is a thousand pities should be suffered to float down the stream of oblivion. Dr. Sullivan deplores the fact that "harmonic music has now penetrated the last retreat of Irish melody; the pipes are dying out, and the 'Irish bands' harmonized for different instruments by *ignoramuses* will soon kill all the peculiarities of the music,

while the performers will kill even the rhythmical residue." The music of which "*Eileen aroon*" (better known as "*Robin Adair*") is a not unfair sample surely deserves a better fate than this.

Besides excelling in music, the old Gael used medical baths, wore straw hats, had umbrellas, knew how to temper steel, and were clever dyers with very simple appliances. On the other hand they never got beyond the "*brogue*"—the shoe of raw hide fastened round the foot while green, and always afterwards needing to be wetted when used. Their windows had shutters, they were very strict in their sanitary arrangements, they worked the Wicklow gold mines, and wore gold chains and finger-rings, and carried silver shields in processions. They *did* build in stone—for the *clochans* on the isles of Arran, and still more the "*city*" of Fahan, near Ventry, are buildings and not mere piles. And yet till the time of St. Adamnan (biographer of St. Columbkille, A.D. 698) their women used to join as matter of course in battle. They worked magic (druid in the old stories means merely a magician) and foretold the future by methods of which a very few have survived the "*weeding out*" of Christian transcribers. Their literary culture was out of all proportion with their material civilization. Their schools of different grades are in O'Curry's account quite a pattern to modern times, and the course of education was so elaborate that we cease to wonder at "*satirists who could make men drop dead for shame, and raise such a blemish on a king's face that he would have to be deposed, as unfit to govern, nay, whose satire was so pungent that it would even make rats fall down dead.*" They had "*poor scholars*" (Adamnan was one of them) regularly provided for by what we may term *sizarships*. Before the middle of the 6th century there were large schools at Clonard, Emly, Glasnevin, and many other places. Indeed the love of literature was fully equalled by the liberal support given to literary institutions. No wonder the existing Irish MSS. (tales, romances, histories, poems, &c.) are still wonderfully numerous, in spite of the destruction which has befallen so many of them.

But we must hasten to conclude; and we shall conclude as we began, by expressing our conviction that the study of Celtic literature is a sure way to bring about a better understanding between the two races (or, rather, branches of the same race). These old Gael not only made won-

derful poetry, but they were proficient in many of the arts of life—masters, too, of several styles of ornamentation. Moreover, by their laws they prove their common origin with ourselves. Having to deal with the descendants of such a people, it is well to ask ourselves how it is that we have not got on so comfortably together as we might. We and they are brethren, after all; well for both if henceforward we determine to act as brethren. No one, at any rate, can pretend to understand the early state of Ireland who has not studied the literature of which the books named at the beginning of this article are a sample. Moore, as long ago as 1839, at a time when it was the fashion to speak very slightly of the old Irish MSS., meeting O'Curry, hard at work in the library of the Royal Irish Academy, was introduced to him by Dr. Petrie. After examining the formidable array of dark and time-worn volumes and having the *Book of Ballymote* explained to him by the two Celtic scholars, Moore said: "Petrie, these huge tomes could not have been written by fools, or for any foolish purpose. I never knew anything about them before; and I had no right to have undertaken the *History of Ireland*." Moore is not the only man, well up in ordinary Irish questions, who "knows nothing" of this branch of Celtic literature. If what we have said shall induce any to pursue the subject further, we shall have done a good work, for such a study cannot fail to loosen the bands of prejudice. Mr. Matthew Arnold tells us (*Study of Celtic Literature*) how he had been taught by his father to think of Celt as separated by an impassable gulf from Teuton. "Certainly the Jew—the Jew of ancient times at least—then seemed a thousand degrees nearer than the Celt to us." Celtic literature taught him to feel otherwise. "Science, insisting that there is no such original chasm between Celt and Saxon, as we once popularly imagined, strengthened this feeling; not in one way only but in others; as an indirect practical result from this science, the sense of antipathy to the Irish people, of radical estrangement from them, has visibly abated among all the better part of us."

This is very true; and we hope that (despite the sneers of a part of the English press at the laughable conduct of some of the Home Rulers) the feeling is a growing one. Books like this of Sir H. S. Maine cannot fail to strengthen it; and viewed in this light such books have a social value far exceeding their literary importance.



ART. III.—*The Unseen Universe ; or, Physical Speculations on a Future State.* Second Edition. London : Macmillan and Co. 1875.

THIS book is an indication, and by no means a solitary one, of a turn in the tide which has of late set in from scientific quarters against scriptural accounts of the origin and end of all things. The writers of it have not made their names public, nor yet avowed their acceptance of any of the creeds of Christendom. Against any misconception as to their objects they have carefully guarded by the following statement in the preface to this second edition:—"Many of our critics seem to fancy that we presume to attempt such an absurdity as a demonstration of Christian truth from a mere physical basis! We simply confute those who (in the outraged name of Science) have asserted that Science is incompatible with Religion." Their standpoint is strictly that of scientific observers, and their aim to reach truth, by whatever route and at whatever cost. This is the spirit in which all such researches should be conducted; and we must do the authors of this book the justice to acknowledge that a measure of success has rewarded their investigations, adding the expression of our sincere pleasure and satisfaction that inquiries prosecuted with such evident ability should have resulted in conclusions so little at war with those of what we believe to be true theology and true philosophy too. At the same time we are not thoroughly satisfied as to the soundness of their method, and are compelled at the outset to qualify our praise.

We think the authors would have shown more wisdom if they had clearly defined their views of Christianity. We cannot learn from any formal statement whether they believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures or not. On that important question they evidently wish to preserve a strict neutrality. But if so, they should have refrained from all comment on the various opinions entertained on the subject of the immortality of the soul, and in fact excised most of the "Introductory Sketch." It is really no introduction

at all: it simply passes in review the notions respecting immortality that have obtained currency in successive ages and in various parts of the world. But the line of the writers of this book is not that of historical criticism: after displaying the general consensus in favour of the great doctrine, they ground no argument upon it. They do not profess to be moral philosophers, but men of science; and, that being the case, they should have adhered strictly to their own chosen path. Not that the two provinces so widely sundered in their position and so vastly extended in their range, of necessity demand to be partitioned out to different detachments of explorers: this very severance of one body of inquirers from another has been a fruitful source of misunderstandings and mistakes: but we do not see that the authors of this book possess the double set of qualifications.

The division of all thinkers into students of the *How* and students of the *Why* of the universe, though a happy figure, is not happily put.

"A division as old as Aristotle separates speculators into two great classes,—those who study the *How* of the Universe, and those who study the *Why*. All men of science are embraced in the former of these, all men of religion in the latter. The former regard the Universe as a huge machine, and their object is to study the laws which regulate its working; the latter again speculate about the object of the machine, and what sort of work it is intended to produce. The disciples of *How* are accused by their adversaries of being willing to sacrifice the individual to the system, while the disciples of *Why* are accused by *their* adversaries of being willing to sacrifice the system to the individual.

"We may compare the Universe to a great ship plying between two well-known ports, and carrying with her two sets of passengers. The one set keep on deck and try to make out, as well as they can, the mind of the steersman regarding the future of their voyage after they have reached that port to which they know they are all fast hastening, while the other set keep down below and examine the engines. Occasionally there is much wrangling at the top of the ladder where the two sets meet, some of those who have examined the engines and the ship asserting that the passengers will all be inevitably wrecked at the next port, it being morally impossible that the good ship can carry them farther. To whom those on deck reply, that they have perfect confidence in the steersman, who has informed some of those nearest him that the passengers will not be wrecked, but will be carried in safety past the port. And so the altercation

goes on ; some who have been on deck being unwilling or unable to examine the engines, and some who have examined the engines preferring to remain below."

Of course, the questions of the Why and the How are not in themselves mutually repugnant: the answers given to each cannot be contradictory and yet both true. Neither is there any necessity that the two classes of inquirers should remain distinct: it is the same human mind in the exercise of the same faculties that conducts the two sets of investigations. The division of the field, and the exclusive occupancy of different sections of it by different bands are evils by no means due to the limitation of the intellectual powers: there have always been master minds capable of surveying the whole range. And our hope for the future lies in the simultaneous cultivation by such as are competent to it of both these great departments, the science of the natural world and the science of the moral sphere, to an extent that has not hitherto been seen. In the meantime, the description of the disciples of How as sacrificing the individual to the system and of the disciples of Why as sacrificing the system to the individual is more to be commended for the sharpness of its antithesis than for its fidelity to facts. An antithesis does exist, taking its rise not in the nature of things but in the passions of men: it would be better expressed by saying that the disciples of How are prone to sacrifice the moral interests of the Universe to the material, and the disciples of Why the reverse. But this language, like that for which we have substituted it, is open to the charge of obscurity. The second paragraph of the above quotation is intended to explain its meaning, yet falls short of a satisfactory analysis of the facts. The passengers on deck trust the steersman, and, being certain of their safety, think only of "sweet fields beyond the swelling flood." The passengers below examine the engines, and are aghast at finding evidences of disorganisation which threaten serious peril. The position occupied by the writers of this book is, we need hardly say, that of a small knot of dissentients in the company below, who through profounder insight have detected, side by side with the signs of disorganisation in the machinery, certain subtle agencies by which the latter may ultimately effect its own most perfect self-repair. They are as independent as their fellows of the testimony of the steersman, but they have good reason of their own for believing

that, after all, he has spoken the truth. This is a fair representation of the views of the authors, but we think the disciples of Why have not been credited with a due share of intelligence in the formation of theirs. It seems a short and easy method of solving the problem of the general safety to say, "We trust the steersman, and therefore need make no further inquiry." The serenity so attained would be in the case supposed the height of absurdity, apart from any examination into the character and competency of the steersman. But in the real world of which the supposed case is but the symbol, the Steersman is also the Owner and Framer of the vessel,—not a mere steersman, but One who at every moment is intimately acquainted with the structure of every part, and who out of the ruins of the old vessel can always construct a new. The only question can be in such a case whether He has really spoken. If it be ascertained that He has spoken, we see no such egregious folly in the attitude of those who regard some deductions of men of science as "premature conclusions, averring that when the laws of nature have been more deeply investigated, there will be found a perfect concord between science and revelation." This, one would think, must be the position occupied by the writers of this book, but they decline to take it, and content themselves with negative statements to the effect that the constitution of the universe as a whole does not bear out the conclusion as to its destructibility that seems to be indicated by a part. Whether they regard revelation as defensible on its own evidences or not they do not say, and, if they have not made up their minds, we wish they had avoided complicating the subject by references to it.

Of what service can it be to quote Egyptians, Brahmins, Magians, Buddhists? If Christianity be a Divine revelation, we need no supplementary evidence from tradition, which, at best, can only point to some primeval revelation, overlaid by the speculations of men. If Christianity be not what it professes to be, the vagaries of senseless superstition will afford small grounds for confidence, and, to speak the truth, so will the soundings of science. The most manly course would have been for the authors of this book, putting their names upon the title-page, to say, "We believe in Christianity as a Divine revelation, all difficulties notwithstanding, and we find its teachings as to immortality rather favoured than frowned upon by our researches

as scientific men." Of the reality of their pretensions to science none could have entertained a doubt, and of their impartiality the evidence would have been as clear as of their frankness. As it is, we do not understand them when they say, on page 8, "we do not mean to assert that Moses got his religious notions from Egypt," and on page 23, in reference to the resurrection of the body as opposed to transmigration, "we are exceedingly surprised that the other alternative doctrine, of manifestly Egyptian parentage, should have come to be accepted by the modern nations of Europe under the garb of Christianity." The doctrine of Moses may have been original, but not, it appears, the doctrine of Christ. What the doctrine of Moses was is not made clear, as "very little is said about man's future state in the Scriptures of the Jews," although "as the nation grew older we find frequent and distinct allusions indicating a belief in a resurrection of some kind." The beliefs of the Jews then were rather due to the growth of the nation, than derived from the authority of Moses, whether inspired or not. It would seem that the authors regard all religious belief as a purely natural phenomenon, for they speak of the conviction of a future state as "the natural result of an implicit faith in God and His goodness, which will not suffer Him to disappoint the natural and innate longings of His intelligent creatures. And such a belief is more likely to arise amongst a nation which has already vividly realised the living presence and goodness of God. Now the ancient Jews were such a nation." We are ourselves sturdy believers in original and innate convictions respecting God and eternal life as having been implanted by the Divine Being Himself in the human mind, but if these be all that we find in the history of the Hebrew nation, we should be ready to abandon our faith in them, for it is obvious that the Hebrews themselves believed that their religious opinions were supernaturally revealed and not naturally educed. But if "practical men like the Jews," as the authors term them, were deceived in so simple a matter as the distinction between the natural and the supernatural we do not see how a line can ever henceforth be drawn between the two. They of all men had the best chance of distinguishing them. We find fault with our authors, not for holding these opinions, but for so loosely expressing them in a work which professedly occupies the scientific standpoint, and in paragraphs imme-

diately subsequent to one in which (p. 8) they state their purpose of treating the subject "without discussing the question of inspiration." They do not discuss it, but their words imply that it is an obsolete dogma, no longer worthy of the notice of thinking men. "Referring to the records of this nation," they discover many historical facts of which they make no question, but the great fact of which the records are brimful is treated as if it had no existence.

Examples may easily be given of the unsatisfactory mode in which the contents as well as the fact of the revelation are dealt with. A sufficient reason why the future world of the Jews should have taken the form of a "bodily existence" and not of an "ethereal state," is found in the fact that the latter was not "a *place* in which practical men like the Jews would wish to dwell." The question of a personal Spirit of Evil is settled by the assertion that we have no "certain account of any such manifestation." The demonology of Scripture "belongs to poetic or semi-parabolic representation of spiritual truths." We can understand a "representation" as "parabolic" or as plain narration of fact: what the "semi-parabolic" may be we do not know. There is no idea called up by the term in the region of thought: there is no entity corresponding to it in the region of existence, for there can be no halting-place between being and not-being, which is all that this word can denote. For the opinion that the Satan of Job is only "the dramatic accuser" we are referred to the authority of Coleridge. Apart from any suspicion which this reference awakens, we may ask whether a "dramatic accuser" does not demand a "dramatic accused," whether Job himself does not in like manner become a dramatised personage, whose sufferings and consolations are alike unreal. There are some who hold that this was indeed the case, that Job is an unhistorical personage. But they would not deny that men have existed whose experiences might resemble those depicted in the Hebrew poem. This is one kind of dramatic representation, an idealisation of actual facts. But in terming Satan the "dramatic accuser" the intention is to assert that there are no facts at all on which the representation is based, that the personage portrayed belongs to a class that does not exist.

It is when we come to the description of the Christian scheme that we find most fault with our authors. The dawning of the idea of a divine communication in the



mind of man is thus set forth. "We cannot go to them" was the unanimous wail of the ancient philosophers, till some of the more hopeful of them suggested as an alternative that they might come to us. For clearly, if A and B are separated from each other by a barrier, and there yet remains goodwill between them, two courses are possible, and only two, if they are to be made acquainted with each other. If A is so weak as to be unable to overleap the barrier, and if at the same time it would be a matter of importance to him to become better acquainted with B, then B may be expected to surmount the barrier if it be surmountable, and exhibit himself to A." Really, this lover's leap kind of illustration scarcely needed to be drawn out to such a length, and made more clear by the introduction of mathematical symbols to denote the parties concerned. We have quoted it, however, on account of what follows. "As a matter of history, it appears that about the time of the birth of Christ there was an expectation, however vague, that something of this nature was about to take place. And when Christ made His appearance, and gathered round Him a little band of disciples, there can be no doubt that He claimed to be the bearer of intelligence from the world of spirits." The following of Christ's appearance upon the expectation of "something of this nature" is here described as if there were some kind of causal connexion between them: did such a connexion exist? Was Christ's claim to supernatural knowledge in any sense or in any degree founded on a perception of the general expectancy? This is what the consecution of the above paragraphs very strongly suggests; but if so, the originality and independence of Christ's mission are at once abandoned. We do not for a moment impute such a purpose to our authors, but we wish they would not indulge in language that apparently commits them to an hypothesis of evolution which explains the greatest events of man's religious history as resulting by a natural sequence from those immediately precedent.

Various expressions occur in the account of the doctrines of Christianity which give rise to strange surmises. The future state taught by Christ was "a bodily state—a state which could even adapt itself with some modification to the views of the Pharisees who believed in the resurrection of the body." To speak of the state of the dead as adapting itself to the views of the living is a curious species of

metonymy. The meaning is simply that between Christ's teachings and those of the Pharisees there existed points of resemblance side by side with very important differences. Of "adaptation" of Christ's views to those held by that or any other sect the New Testament affords no evidence, and a term so misleading and itself so "adapted" to conciliate certain speculatists of the day should therefore not have been employed. After quoting Peter, Paul and John, the authors tell us, "from all this we may conclude that the more advanced disciples of Christ supposed the resurrection body to be angelic in its nature, &c.," from which we are left to infer that these eminent apostles had by deep meditation and research, and not by Divine inspiration, attained profounder views than the generality of Christians, and that these doctrines among other esoteric mysteries were reserved by them from the vulgar gaze. Similar worldly wisdom they and their successors exhibited in the mode in which they turned one phase of their system toward one section of their hearers and another to another. "And so it happened, that when dealing with a lower class of converts, the Christian religion appealed more to their fears than to their hopes, bringing vividly before them the awful nature of hell, while on the other hand, the higher class of converts, if they had not a very clear idea of heaven, were yet drawn with intense longing to a future which they were to spend in the company of Christ." This statement is in striking contrast with Christ's denunciations of the Pharisees and His exultation over the superior illumination of babes: the threatenings of the undying worm and the unquenchable fire are levelled, not against the "little ones," but against those that make them to offend, against the "blind guides" who will not enter the kingdom of heaven themselves, and hinder those who would. It is to the chief men of the Jewish nation that He addresses the warning, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" In close imitation of his Master, Paul does not, on account of the noble station of the transgressor, seek to wean Felix from grosser pleasures by a description of those of the future life, but reasons with him of righteousness, temperance and a judgment to come. Similar has been the method of Paul's successors, or if not, it has been a violation of all early precedents, and not an offence to be charged as above on "the Christian religion."

Any further remarks we may have to make on the introductory chapter must be postponed to their proper place, in connexion with the fuller development of the subjects they refer to. Proceeding to the principles laid down by the authors as the foundation of their argument, we are glad to find ranking foremost among them a recognition of the existence of a Deity who is the Creator of all things. The next position is that all finite intelligences exist under conditions of time, place, and sensation. From this it is, however, a long stride to the conclusion, "that we cannot conceive of purely finite intelligences existing in the universe without some sort of embodiment." We suppose the term "universe" to be employed here in its widest sense, as including the unseen no less than the seen. That "we cannot conceive" how finite intelligences can exist, holding a relation to matter in the sense of being here and not there, and yet not themselves equipped with a material embodiment, may or may not be true; but inconceivability is no test of the possibilities of finite any more than of infinite being. And after all, what is this conception that is so sternly pronounced impossible? We already hold—for this science has taught us—that there is no one set of particles to which the immaterial principle is in our present state of existence continuously attached: only some particles there must be in a certain connexion with each other in order to the spirit's continuance in its present modes of activity. But does it follow that as soon as the connexion is dissolved which such particles had maintained with each other and with the animating spirit, some other set of particles must take their place, or else the spirit can no longer be conditioned by time, place and sensation? We trow not. The intended bearing of this upon the subject of immortality it is hard to see: it cannot be that a resurrection is thereby rendered imperative: it would seem to establish rather that a dissolution is, in the proper sense, impossible.

Some strange observations are next made on the comparative impression of reality made upon us by mind and matter. "Can we conceive a single particle of matter to go out of the universe for six or eight hours and then to return to it; but do we not every day see our consciousness disappearing in the case of deep sleep, or in a swoon, and then returning to us again?" The comparison here is not fairly drawn. Matter is placed on the one side over against

consciousness; now consciousness is not mind, but a generic term for the phenomena of mind. That these phenomena are all suspended in sleep is not proved, but granting it to be so, nobody doubts the identity of the mind which undergoes this suspension of its functions, any more than the identity of the particles of ice which under the operation of heat lose their cohesiveness, and manifest in the form of vapour the opposite principle of repulsion. Neither do we comprehend the attempted explanation of the connexion between mind and matter. "When a certain number of material particles, consisting of phosphorus, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and perhaps some others, are, in consequence of the operation of their physical forces, in a certain position with respect to each other, and in a certain state of motion, consciousness is the result." Does this dependence of consciousness upon a certain array of material particles mean that the mind of which consciousness is the attribute, is the product of those particles? If so, truly this is an explanation that needs another to explain it. In the next paragraph this is professedly given. "Now this means that matter must be looked upon as the mistress of the house, and consciousness as an occasional visitor whom she permits to take of her hospitality, turning him out of doors whenever the larder is empty." We have here a somewhat piquant if not very polished representation of the mutual relations of matter and mind, an improvident and ungenerous housekeeper playing at hide-and-seek with a hungry guest. But what has our philosophy gained by the figure? It may be that all this is only intended as a presentment of the objections of materialism: if so, the purpose should have been made more clear. On the next page the authors plainly show that we cannot argue from phosphorus outside the brain to phosphorus inside it, and that we have no right to assume that nothing but visible particles exist in the body.

Admitting with them the intimate relation of the body to the mind as at present known to us, we demur to a conclusion they draw respecting the necessity of some material organ in order to the maintenance by the spirit of what they term a "hold upon the past," or, in ordinary language, memory. This phrase, "hold upon the past," is another of those ambiguous expressions which seem to be invented for the purpose of clouding to our view the great chasm between matter and mind. Is it upon the material

landscapes, houses, and men it has once beheld, that the spirit retains its "hold," or upon its own images of these things? If the latter, the operation is a purely spiritual one, not demanding a material organ, though possibly, like other spiritual activities such as emotion and volition, producing material and visible effects. This is in fact only a repetition of what has been said before. From the archangel to the brute "something analogous to an organ of memory" must be possessed by each. That is, there is no such thing as an unbodied finite spirit: a likely conjecture, perhaps, but by no means an established fact. The same remarks apply to the assertion that there must be an organ which shall confer "the possibility of action," i.e., of movement, "in the present." These two propositions are to be kept in mind, "since it is upon those that our argument will ultimately be built." Surely, if so, the argument rests upon a frail foundation. What, we are constrained to inquire, is the precise signification of "a bodily organ"? From the context we should gather that it denotes an accretion of phosphorus and other similar substances. But it may turn out that this is very far from being intended by the authors. On this point we must defer any observations we may have to make, till we see what use is made of the axiom which they have laid down: in the meantime, we must express our belief that it is only an unproved assumption, and one that is by no means self-evident.

The great axiom, however, on which the argument of this volume rests is that which next comes into view, under the title of "the Principle of Continuity." Our chief quarrel here is with the statement and illustration, rather than with the thing itself. The principle is illustrated from the history of astronomy, in which theory after theory has been devised, each in its turn accounting for a wider and wider range of observed facts, until at last one simpler than all its predecessors is found which harmonises all the facts that ever have been or shall be recorded. And the statement which sums up all is as follows:—"It thus appears that, assuming the existence of a Supreme Governor of the universe, the principle of Continuity may be said to be the definite expression in words of a trust that He will not put us to permanent intellectual confusion, and we can easily conceive similar expressions of trust with reference to the other faculties of man." What this last clause may mean we cannot comprehend. Besides intellectual faculties,

man exhibits emotions and volitions; now emotional confusion and volitional confusion are meaningless collocations of words, for confusion can only be intellectual. If the meaning be that God will not permit our emotions and volitions to be called forth by the noblest of objects only to be balked of their legitimate satisfactions, we can heartily endorse the sentiment, but this only because otherwise He would put us to "intellectual confusion." It is to this law of non-confusion then that we must direct our attention. The terms appear a little vague. First, as to the meaning of "intellectual confusion." Does it refer to some violation by the Diving Being of His own attributes? This certainly can never occur, but no one will suppose that this is what is meant. Does it refer to some violation of the laws of thought which the Divine Being might require at our hands? This likewise might seem an unnecessary supposition. Surely the meaning cannot be that nothing shall transcend our thought so as to remain involved in mystery; that none of those ways which are now inscrutable shall long continue to deserve the apostolic description of them as "past finding out;" that the How and the Why of every event in the whole domain of nature shall one day be explained. We may ask further, why this limitation as to time, and how far does it extend? The "intellectual confusion" shall not be permanent, but why it should be permitted at all is a mystery which we fear the ages will not unravel. Then, since it is not to be permanent, when shall the era of universal enlightenment (for to be worth anything it must be universal) dawn? Shall it be postponed to a future state of existence or consummated within the bounds, however distant, of ever-lengthening time? In either case, what are we to do, for whom confusion, cleared away from some of our mental chambers, hangs all the more heavily on the rest? Are we to content ourselves with the assurance that every cloud will one day be lifted, and that we shall then see all things clearly? This is what for long ages men have been endeavouring to do, but their warrant for this confidence has been drawn rather from revelation than from science. Yet the principle of Continuity is set down among "physical axioms."

So far as we can attach any force or validity to this principle, it is identical with what is commonly called the Law of Causation, considered both as a law of thought and a law of things. A good deal depends on the way in which



the law is enounced. To say that "every effect must have a cause" is to give utterance to an identical proposition, for effect implies cause. The best way of expressing it is perhaps to say that "every finite event is to be referred ultimately to the agency of some force under the control of intelligence." Considered as an expectation of the human mind, this is a law of thought: considered as verified in the workings of nature, it is a law of things. But under the term intelligence is obviously included the human as well as the Divine; and, as a consequence, when we trace any phenomenon up to some volitional act which gives birth to it, the law of causation, so far from being subverted, is satisfied. This seems to be allowed by the authors themselves. Freedom is not by them denied to the human mind through their adoption of the principle of continuity. They ascribe to man "the power of calling internal forces into play at irregular intervals dependent on his will." The irregularity of this action, its unaccountableness except as the result of free volition, implies no breach of continuity, or else our authors are inconsistent with themselves. It may be said perhaps that they have not intended to include human actions in their range of investigation. But if they confine themselves to the operations of inanimate nature, the question must be raised whether these are not directly or indirectly the works of an Intelligence to whom a less measure of free agency cannot be attributed than to His creature man? True, there may be an exactness about these operations that cannot be paralleled in those of the creature, but this does not affect the question whether or no a Free Agent stands at the back of them all.

The bearing of these remarks will be seen when it is understood that the first application made by our authors of the principle of Continuity is to the miracles of Christ. "Until of late years, the divines who have asserted the actual occurrence of these events have attached to this assertion an hypothesis of their own, representing the events in question as absolute interferences of the Divine Governor with His usual physical procedure. Each was thus supposed to represent in its physical aspect something that could not possibly be deduced from that which went before or that followed after." Here we must observe that the explanation of miracles as due to absolute interferences of the Divine Governor is not to be ascribed to divines as

"an hypothesis of their own:" it is the explanation given by the New Testament writers themselves. The miracles are free actings of the Divine will, just as much so as those of every human will, and like them, "not to be deduced from that which went before:" it is needless to add, "nor from that which followed after," for the cause is always supposed to be antecedent to its effects. They differ from human actions in that they require no bodily medium for their performance, and still more in that they can originate new forces instead of only combining those which previously existed. These differences, however, do not affect the question of interference with natural order. The operation of natural law is counteracted every time we execute any bodily movement, as certainly as in those tremendous judgments which made the magicians exclaim, "This is the finger of God!" Such is the view of the miraculous taken everywhere in Scripture, as well as by orthodox divines in every age; and the attributing it to the latter as an invention of their own is as great a misrepresentation as that which follows, viz., the assertion that of late they have changed their tone. The Babbage's calculating machine explanation, which our authors regard as having wholly displaced the original one, is a puerile conceit that has obtained the sanction of very few names. The universe is therein pictured as "a machine which after having worked for a long time according to a particular method of procedure, should suddenly manifest a single breach in its method, and then resume and for ever afterwards keep to its original law." How observers of such a mode of procedure are to escape "permanent intellectual confusion," we do not know. The exception to the method is either apparent or real. If the former, we are deceived, for we have no means of certifying ourselves that the universe is a Babbage's machine: if the latter, we have still the explanation to seek.

The difference between us and the authors will now be tolerably clear. They hold the principle of continuity or the law of causation in one sense: we hold it in another. They hold it inconsistent with this principle that the established laws of nature should be set aside even by their Author: we hold that the Being who has appointed them may and does at pleasure counteract their operation, and has given the same power to the children of men in so far as He enables them to play off one force against another.

What they plead for is invariable sequence alone : what we plead for is invariable sequence plus the freedom of the will. Which of these explanations best fits the facts of experience, ordinary and miraculous too, we must leave our readers to judge. "Continuity" is certainly the phrase which best expresses their view : it has the true ring of scientific invariableness about it, but to us it sounds like the knell of moral liberty. "Causation" embraces all the truth involved in the principles of science, and the truth of the moral domain as well. Miracles, in fine, put our authors to "permanent intellectual confusion:" to us, regarding them as the result, not of some unknown higher natural law, but of moral necessities urgent enough to override established order, they appear a part of the wonderful wisdom of God.

The reason why our authors are so anxious to bring miracle within the province pervaded by their principle of continuity, is discovered by the paragraphs that follow. They would thereby take the last stumbling-block out of the way of men of science who are eager to believe in immortality, but who think their science is against them. We are not disposed to find fault with their design, nor yet with the means by which they would effect it, provided that the latter be looked upon simply in the light of an *argumentum ad hominem*. Put briefly, the argument is this. Men of science believe that the history of the universe exhibits a chain of invariable sequences, cause producing effect and effect following cause in regular order from the moment of their origination by the First Cause. From that moment nature has never been interfered with : all things continue as they were. The principle of continuity discovered in nature, and which appears to redound so much to the glory of God, demands the eternal continuance in some form or other of the universe as a sphere of Divine operation : otherwise, there will be by-and-by causes inadequate to the production of effects, and effects incapable of becoming causes. Nevertheless, strange as it may seem, this gulf of annihilation is the fate toward which the visible universe is gradually tending. The fund of energy never diminishes, but its availableness is decreasing day by day. Nature proclaims its own mortality, its ultimate extinction as a theatre of life and activity, albeit without the destruction of a single atom of its mass or a single measure of its energy. What becomes then of

the principle of continuity? If the philosopher surrender it, he must cease to be a philosopher: the death of nature, however distant, puts a period to philosophy at once, for the universe as a whole being purposeless and meaningless, so likewise are all its parts. If the philosopher refuse to submit to this alternative, he must find some means of disposing of the dead universe. What becomes of its unspent energies, whose only incapacity for working lies in the fact that their inequalities have through the lapse of ages been destroyed? The authors say that from the present visible universe they pass into, and form the substratum of, the invisible world.

Men of science, then, if they will adhere to their law of continuity, are bound to accept some such theory of transmutation as the authors announce, for continuity that comes to an end is a contradiction in terms. This view approximates to, but does not identify itself with, the scriptural (not to demean it by calling it the orthodox) view of the end of the visible universe. The Scriptures teach, like these modern speculatists, that there shall be new heavens and a new earth after the first heavens and the first earth have passed away. There is a difference, however. The Scriptures, which everywhere declare God's continual presence in, and administration of, His own universe, predict the mode of the final consummation, ascribing it to His direct intervention. Our authors regard it as a purely natural process, the result of forces now and always at work in the visible universe. The Scriptures speak of such special acts of God as commencing and concluding the story of the universe, and as also continuing to occur at intervals throughout its course. Our authors regard all such acts as alike inconceivable and impossible: they are breaches of continuity, which put them to "permanent intellectual confusion."

We now see why they are so anxious to bring miracles under the dominion of continuity: if these are satisfactorily established breaches of it, the principle falls to the ground. Miracle being conceded to occur in the very midst of the reign of invariable law, miracle may still more probably be admitted both to unfold and to wind up the scene. But if miracle itself be a part of natural order, the natural order which has never been broken may be presumed to last for ever. We cannot accept this argument, looking at it from the standpoint we

occupy ourselves, but as addressed to men of a different school we think it has its value.

A few weighty objections occur to us, which it may be well to set down here. It is not simply that this scheme, while seeking to reconcile men of science to Christianity, really sacrifices the foundation on which Christianity rests. It comes to us associated with tenets of philosophy and conjectures of science from which we must confess that we recoil.

In the first place, we see that our authors are under the influence of that system of philosophy which, while acknowledging the existence of a God, thinks it does homage to Him by bestowing upon Him the unmeaning title of "the Unconditioned." We know what to expect when we meet with this phrase. The Being who is not Himself conditioned by time, place and sensation, is arbitrarily assumed to be incapable of holding direct relations with beings that are. Creation, the sole admissible point of contact between the infinite and the finite, retreats to an infinite distance. "We claim it as the heritage of intelligence that there shall be an endless vista, reaching from eternity to eternity, in each link of which we shall be led only from one form of the conditioned to another, never from the conditioned to the unconditioned, or absolute, which would be to us no better than an impenetrable intellectual barrier." What is this but to say that the Creator, being unconditioned, could not create, because that would require us to regard "the same Person as conditioning and yet conditioned"? Everything besides God is conditioned, and conditioned by Him; but the moment we represent Him to ourselves as placing the conditions, we are compelled to stop, because in so doing we subject Him to conditions. Creation we once fondly thought to have taken place at some definite epoch separated from us by an interval which might be estimated, if not in revolutions of the sun, yet in periods marked off by some great cosmical phenomena. But no: this would be an act done in time, and one not to be ascribed to the unconditioned: put it back through eternal ages, and then—the fact is admitted after having been emptied of all significance. Creation we once thought also to be the production of a definite quantity of matter: this likewise would be a finite exertion of omnipotence, and so unworthy of it: the universe, therefore, must be infinite in its range. But if the

universe be both infinite and eternal, we see no reason for introducing a Deity at all, much less one who, being unconditioned, is also in every sense incomprehensible. God is not revealed then even in nature : and what the Scriptures call His works are not His works in any true and proper sense. He is at best the unknown God, whose altar may well remain unerected, because we know not whether He can condescend to accept our offerings.

We must not omit the use made by our authors in this connexion of the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity. Following in the wake of certain philosophers, they regard the second and third Persons of the Trinity as occupied, to the exclusion of the first, in the work of fashioning the heavens and the earth and all things that are therein. We are fully aware that in the Scriptures the Son and the Spirit are assigned a part in the work of creation, not however to the exclusion of the Father. Neither is there any warrant for the division of the work between the two after the manner suggested by our authors, allotting to the one the developing of the objective, and to the other that of the subjective, elements of the universe,—to the one the energy and to the other the life. For the Son is said to have life in Himself, and the Spirit to have garnished the heavens. But while we object on scriptural grounds to this rash appropriation of scripture mysteries, we marvel much that the authors should not see that in reference to the second and third Persons they have perpetrated the very blunder which in the case of the first they have warned others not to commit. The Scriptures, they say, “indicate the existence of another Being of the same substance as the Father, but different in person, and who has agreed to develope the will of the Father, and thus in some mysterious sense to submit to conditions and to enter into the universe.” How, we ask, can the two sacred Persons be of the same substance, and yet the one be conditioned and the other not? Unless the Son be unconditioned in the same sense as the Father, He is not Jehovah’s Fellow. If He be unconditioned as Divine, and conditioned as human, or in virtue of His relations of any kind to the conditioned universe, then He is at once conditioned and unconditioned too, which is absurd. It may be said that the Christian doctrine of Christ’s person is open to the same charge, since it represents the same Being as at once finite and infinite. But we contend that,



despite its etymology, the term infinite is a positive term, and not a mere negation of the finite: but unconditioned is a pure negation of conditioned. The mystery of the Person of Christ is as great a stumbling-block to our authors as the relation of the second Person to the first. Another pair of contradictory attributions we find in the Introductory Sketch. "Christ must in this sense," *i.e.*, in His conformity with the laws of the universe, "be regarded as similar to man; but inasmuch as the relation of Christ to the universe was different from that of any mere man, so the works of Christ are to be regarded as different from those which any mere man can accomplish." How there could be "a total submission of Christ in every respect towards all the laws of the universe," side by side with the performance of works "different from those which any mere man can accomplish" we cannot, on the authors' hypothesis, understand. What works are those beyond any that man can accomplish, to which the title of miracles in the true and proper sense is nevertheless to be denied?

The whole phraseology of the "unconditioned" would be better banished from philosophy. It does not explain the contact of the finite with the infinite, and it cannot get rid of it. Creation must be accepted as an act which has relations both to time and space, and as performed by a Being who has relations to time and space, though His own nature is not limited thereby; just as the spirit in man has relation to the extended, and yet is itself unextended. And, once admitted, creation must, like miracle, prove fatal to the authors' idea of continuity. The one implies a beginning, as the other implies a break, in the chain of physical causes and effects; and from either it is to be inferred that the chain may have an end. The doctrine of continuity in the sense pointed out, demanding as it does the sacrifice both of creation and miracle, affords no evidence to our minds in favour of the Christian doctrine of immortality. This is not much to be wondered at; but we do find something that astonishes us in the results that arise from an attempt to apply the authors' principle to the ordinary operations of nature. Here, omitting all reference to the agency of man, we should suppose that continuity—"that principle which has been the guide of all modern scientific advance"—would have it all its own way. Here at least we shall see invariable sequence in its most unequivocal form, the effect every-

where following upon the cause with mechanical precision, and event answering to expectation in a way which never puts us to "permanent intellectual confusion."

And this may be granted to be the case so long as we confine our attention to dead matter. But as soon as we come to the phenomena of life, what is our amazement to find that "side by side with the general law that like produces like, there is a tendency to minor variations." That this is not a mere case of possible mal-observation is evident from the following emphatic utterance: "Now it is well known that there occurs occasionally an unaccountable variation, so marked in its nature as to be worthy of historical record." Cases are quoted in proof of the position that in the animal creation "permanent varieties may be produced by artificial selection," and the inference is that, as Darwin teaches, natural selection may do the same. This is designed, of course, to establish the doctrine of development, and, for aught we know, that doctrine may be the true explanation of the history of the universe. But if so, the principle of continuity falls to the ground. Development and continuity are disharmonious terms. Development involves the variable: continuity the invariable. The reduction of the variations within the narrowest limits, and the expansion of the period of their elaboration to the vastest cycles, will not render them in the smallest degree less unaccountable. Every variation from a fixed type is a break in the chain of sequences. The only example we know of continuous variation is that of a curve, each successive point of which is by an infinitesimal amount farther than the one before it from a given straight line. But this is only a mathematical conception: such a curve never did exist. Every actual variation must be of finite, not infinitesimal, proportions; and to every such variation may be applied the authors' assertion that "it constitutes our duty as well as our privilege to grasp the meaning of all events that come before us." It may be said that with more knowledge this chasm would be filled, and the different types of animal turn out to be due simply to different arrangements of particles of phosphorus, &c. But how came there to be different arrangements? Arrangements imply an intelligence to ordain and effect them; and if they are ordained from eternity, it must be confessed that they are effected in time: if so, what brings them to pass? Not the particles themselves, for they are the subjects not the

agents of the changes. Why not recognise in all this the hand of God?

The authors suppose that all the phenomena we have in these latter paragraphs been alluding to, viz., miracle, creation, the original production of life, and, to go no farther, the first production of man, are really breaks, which the principle of continuity will not account for if attention be confined to the visible universe, but which yield homage to that principle so soon as the invisible universe is brought into the account. But their language respecting the invisible universe, like much more of their language when not employed about science itself, is inexact and misleading. Sometimes the invisible universe appears to denote the spiritual beings that belong to it, and includes angels (at least good angels), and Christ, considered as ranking with the conditioned. And the present contact is admitted of these beings with ourselves, and with material agencies. How it is that we, as being truly invisible intelligences, are excluded from this higher order of existence, we do not know: surely our present tenancy of material habitations ought not to shut us out, for according to our authors all created intelligences are supposed to possess some organism. Again, at other times the invisible universe is spoken of as the final receptacle, so to speak, of all the unspent energies of the visible, as well as the storehouse from which they originally issued. But here we suspect a play upon words. Surely the word "invisible" cannot be intended to confound under one indiscriminating title substances so distinct as spirit, whether human or angelic, and the forces, however subtle, by which spirit may manifest its presence and put forth its power. If light, ether, energy of whatsoever kind, are to be classed with the invisible world as distinct from the visible, or even to be regarded as passing from the one into the other, then we submit that the distinction between the two worlds in the sense intended by our authors is no longer tenable. The unseen universe is here, for we, as spirits, belong to it: the seen universe is yonder, for light, heat, &c., find their way out of and into it: the two universes are therefore one.

The unseen universe, in fact, as thus represented, is a convenient medium for connecting the unknowable and unconditioned Source of being with His finite creation. The object is to "push back the Great First Cause in time as far as possible," back indeed "into the durational depths

of the universe, into the eternity of the past," and yet not to "get rid of God." We do not see what is thus gained to science in additional knowledge, nor what is gained in additional glory to the ever-blessed God. If we may speak our minds as believers in the Christian revelation, we would say that we are sensible of a discord between these principles of science and philosophy which represent Him as very far off, and those teachings of Holy Writ which assure us that He is very nigh. Nature displays many operations, marvellous alike for their grandeur and their delicacy: revelation points to them as the handiwork of God. Science and philosophy agree to confess the facts: how then or why do they contest the explanation? We know of no absurd consequences to which the admission would lead: neither science nor philosophy would by it be demeaned, much less interdicted from their legitimate vocation. They would then become what the elder of them was once styled, "the study of things divine and human." There would still be room for debate as to where the line should be drawn between those operations whose laws are made plain to us and whose course is therefore calculable, and those whose secrets baffle created intelligence and therefore appear to be reserved by the Almighty among the "counsels of His own will." But the free agency of God would be recognised side by side with its dim adumbration, the free agency of man, and moral causation would rank as a principle on a par with natural continuity. The end the authors have in view, the justification of the ways of God to men from an examination of His footsteps in nature, would be fully accomplished without the aid of speculations which, as it seems to us, either start from false principles or make an unwarrantable use of true ones.

While compelled to adopt a line of adverse criticism towards the philosophisings of this book, we are constrained to render a tribute of respect to its science. The chapter entitled "The Present Physical Universe" is full of important reasonings, founded on the best established results of modern enquiry. The authors demonstrate to a certainty that, apart from any hypothesis of cataclysm or convulsion, such as we believe to be favoured by revelation, the material universe, as we now behold it, must have an end. Strange to say, the principle known as "the conservation of energy," instead of invalidating, itself supports this conclusion. The chief points of the argument are the following:—Matter

or stuff has both an objective and a substantive existence: objective, as it is not part and parcel of ourselves; substantive, as it really exists and is not a mere phenomenon of something else. For this we might have been referred at once to the testimony of the senses, but the authors rest their proof upon the fact that we cannot produce or destroy the smallest quantity of matter. This may be a proof of its objectivity, but scarcely of its substantiality: if it shows it does not belong to us, it hardly guarantees its independent existence. For this last we seem shut up to the common convictions of mankind. But, however established, this principle, or rather these two principles, are only stepping-stones to another. "As soon as we grant this, we are obliged by our reason to allow objective reality to whatever is found to be in the same sense conserved." In this category is to be placed force. But it is not of every force, nor of every form in which force may be expressed, that the principle of conservation holds good in the sense in which it holds good of matter. One such form is momentum, or the product of mass and velocity, which so far admits the principle of conservation that "the momentum of any system of bodies, measured in any direction whatever, is not altered by their mutual action." But here direction has to be taken into the account, a limitation that does not exist in the case of another form of the measurement of energy, viz., its *vis viva*, or power of doing work. This is the product of the mass into the square of the velocity, and is independent of the direction in which it may act. This has conservation in the sense attributed to matter itself. An illustration serves to set it forth more clearly.

"We have just now spoken about a cannon ball fired into the air against the force of gravity. Such a ball, as it mounts, will each moment lose part of its velocity, until it finally comes to a standstill, after which it will begin to descend. When it is just turning it is perfectly harmless, and if we were standing on the top of a cliff to which it had just reached, we might without danger catch it in our arms and lodge it on the cliff. Its energy has apparently disappeared. Let us, however, see whether this is really true or not. It was fired up at us, let us say, by a foe at the bottom of the cliff, and the thought occurs to us to drop it down upon him again, which we do with great success, for he is smashed to pieces by the ball.

"In truth, dynamics informs us that such a ball will again strike

the ground with a velocity, and therefore with an energy, precisely equal to that with which it was originally projected upwards. Now when at the top of the cliff, if it had not the energy due to actual motion, it had, nevertheless, some sort of energy due to its elevated position, for it had obviously the power of doing work. We thus recognise two forms of energy which change into one another, the one due to actual motion and the other to position; the former of these is generally called kinetic, and the latter potential, energy."

It is then shown that this is only an example of the forms in which energy may appear, there being in fact a great variety of them, some potential and some kinetic, to which the same principle of conservation applies. The modern statement of this principle is only an extension of Newton's third law of motion, and may be thus given:—

*"In any system of bodies whatever, to which no energy is communicated by external bodies, and which parts with no energy to external bodies, the sum of the various potential and kinetic energies remains for ever unaltered. In other words, while the one form of energy becomes changed into the other,—potential into kinetic and kinetic into potential,—yet each change represents at once a creation of the one kind of energy and a simultaneous and equal annihilation of the other, the sum of both, as we have already said, remaining meanwhile unaltered."*

This is conservation in the same sense as the conservation of matter, and the following conclusion is deduced therefrom by the authors.

"Taking as our system the whole physical universe, we now see that, according to the test we have already laid down, energy has as much claim to be regarded as an objective reality as matter itself. But the forms of statement are most markedly different for the two. We before spoke of the quantity of matter without qualification, but we now speak of *the sum of the two kinds of energy*. Let us think for a moment of this, and we see that whereas (to our present knowledge at least) matter is always the same, though it may be masked in various combinations, energy is constantly changing the form in which it presents itself. The one is like the eternal unchangeable Fate or *Necessitas* of the ancients; the other is Proteus himself in the variety and rapidity of its transformation."

We have already observed in the case of matter that there is no need to go to the doctrine of conservation for the proof of its objective reality, and the same remark



may apply to the forces of the physical universe. We know that they are not part and parcel of us, however we may use them; and it adds little to the weight of this conviction to be assured that they remain uninfluenced by anything external to themselves. But however that may be, objectivity is not substantiality: the various exhibitions of energy may be still only affections of matter. The bearing of this will be seen presently. The next important step, however, is the statement that in order to any movement or change, and therefore in order to any manifestation of life as we know it, energy must be capable not only of conservation but of transformation from one form into another.

*"Energy is of use to us solely because it is constantly being transformed. When the sluice is shut, or the fire put out, the machinery stops; when a man cannot digest his food, he breaks down altogether. Coal in itself, except on account of an occasional fossil it may contain, or its still somewhat uncertain mode of formation, or (to take a lower point of view) as a material for ornament, is a very useless thing indeed: its grand value consists in its chemical affinity, in virtue of which it possesses great potential energy as regards the oxygen of the air, which can very easily be transformed into its equivalent in heat. 'Keep your powder dry' is merely one way of saying 'preserve the ready transformability of your energy.' In fact, if we think for a moment over what has just been said, to the effect that the only real things in the universe are matter and energy, and that of these matter is simply passive, it is obvious that all the physical changes which take place, including those which are inseparably associated with the thoughts as well as the actions of living beings, are merely transformations of energy. Thus it is an enquiry of the very utmost importance as regards the present universe: Are all forms of energy equally susceptible of transformation? To see the importance of this question, the reader has only to reflect that if there be one form of energy less readily or less completely transformable than the others, and if transformations constantly go on, more and more of the whole energy of the universe will inevitably sink into this lower grade as time advances. Hence the whole possibility of transformation must steadily grow less and less; in scientific language, though the quantity of energy remains for ever unchanged, its availability steadily decreases.*

*"Now, everyone knows a case in which there may be an unlimited amount of energy present, no part of which is available for transformation. It is the simple one of heat in a number of*

bodies, when all are *at the same temperature*. To obtain work from heat we must have hotter and colder bodies, to correspond, as it were, with the boiler and condenser of a heat engine; and just as we get no work from still water if it be all at the same level, *i.e.*, if no part of it can fall, so in like manner we can get no work from heat unless part of it can fall from a higher to a lower temperature."

We need not go into the details of the scientific proof adduced by our authors to show that the instances quoted in the last paragraph are only examples of a law which pervades the universe. Their inference is as follows:—

"It thus appears that at each transformation of heat-energy into work a large portion is degraded, while only a small portion is transformed into work. So that while it is very easy to change all of our mechanical or useful energy into heat, it is only possible to transform a portion of this heat-energy back again into work. After each change too the heat becomes more and more dissipated or degraded, and less and less available for any future transformation."

The consequences of this doctrine in their bearing on the fate of the visible universe are then described.

"In other words, the tendency of heat is towards equalisation; heat is *par excellence* the communist of our universe, and it will no doubt ultimately bring the system to an end. This universe may in truth be compared to a vast heat-engine. . . . The sun is the furnace or source of high-temperature heat of our system, just as the stars are for other systems, and the energy which is essential to our existence is derived from the heat which the sun radiates, and represents only a very small portion of that heat. But while the sun thus supplies us with energy he is himself getting colder, and must ultimately, by means of radiation into space, part with the life-sustaining power which he at present possesses. Besides the cooling of the sun we must also suppose that, owing to something analogous to ethereal friction, the earth and the other planets of our system will be drawn spirally nearer and nearer to the sun, and will at length be engulfed in its mass. In each such case there will be, as the result of the collision, the conversion of visible energy into heat, and a partial and temporary restoration of the power of the sun. At length, however, this process will have come to an end, and he will be extinguished, until, after long but not immeasurable ages, by means of the same ethereal friction, his black mass is brought into contact with that of his nearest neighbour.

"Not much further need we dilate on this. It is absolutely

certain that life, so far as it is physical, depends essentially on transformations of energy; it is also absolutely certain that age after age the possibility of such transformations is becoming less and less; and, so far as we yet know, the final state of the present universe must be an aggregation (into one mass) of all the matter it contains, *i.e.*, the potential energy gone, and a practically useless state of kinetic energy, *i.e.*, uniform temperature throughout that mass."

With bold but steady hand the authors paint the scenes this universe may witness before its ultimate extinction, the death-struggles which may arrest, though they cannot avert, the final and irretrievable collapse.

"But the present potential energy of the solar system is so enormous, approaching in fact possibly to what in our helplessness we call infinite, that it may supply for absolutely incalculable future ages what is required for the physical existence of life. Again, the fall together, from the distance of Sirius, let us say, of the sun and an equal star would at once supply the sun with at least thirty times as much energy for future radiation to possible planets as could possibly have been acquired by his own materials in falling together from practically infinite diffusion as a cloud of stones or dust, or a nebula; so that it is certain that, if the present physical laws remain long enough in operation, there will be (at immense intervals of time) mighty catastrophes due to the crashing together of defunct suns—the smashing of the greater part of each into nebulous dust surrounding the remainder, which will form an intensely-heated nucleus—then, possibly, the formation of a new and larger set of planets, with a proportionately larger and hotter sun, a solar system on a far grander scale than the present. And so on, growing in grandeur but diminishing in number till the exhaustion of energy is complete, and after that eternal rest, so far at least as visible motion is concerned."

The course of physical events here described may seem marvellously similar to that predicted in revelation, but the resemblance is wholly superficial. In the former we have a series of transformations springing from purely natural causes: in the latter we are taught to expect a direct intervention of the Creator. It may be asked how we are to distinguish between the natural and the supernatural when the theatre of action is so vast and the catastrophe so sudden and tremendous. The answer is easy. In the natural, we have the necessary result of forces constantly at work: in the supernatural, we have

the free actings of the will of God without regard to the laws itself has imposed. Physical forces effectuate the one: moral motives determine the other. The final consummation will be postponed until certain specified events have come to pass upon the earth, events dependent partly on the free-will of man. "The Gospel must first be preached among all nations, and then shall the end come." "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first." Here are events predicted, and therefore certain: they depend however on the agency of man and are therefore also contingent, not necessary. Other events, the coming of Christ and the close of this world's history, are in like manner predicted and therefore certain; yet they are dependent on the occurrence of the former, and so contingent. Events like these cannot be confounded with purely natural operations, which obey a mechanical necessity and are independent of the virtues and vices of those whose interests may be affected by them.

Such a view as that of events seemingly miraculous happening to synchronise, or being foreseen to synchronise, with certain others in the moral sphere would lead to absurd conclusions. Applying this principle to what has already taken place, we should be obliged to hold that, just when men grew too wicked to live, a deluge happened which took them all away; that, just when Moses wanted Pharaoh to let the people go, certain calamities happened, which tended to serve his purpose; that, just when Christ was passing through the villages of Galilee, the sick people that were there happened to get well. But this would only account for cases in which the miracle might have been explained from mere coincidence: it will not answer in the case of rising from the dead. Neither will it fit the case of the reconstruction of the universe. The death of time and the birth of eternity are not natural events which chance to coincide with the completion of the number of the elect: they are solemn decrees of the Judge of quick and dead.

Besides, so far as this earth is concerned, the catastrophe predicted by the authors is after all dissimilar in its external characteristics from that described in revelation. Considered as purely physical events, there is nothing common to the two. So far as concerns this earth and the human race upon it, which are all we have to consider, what the authors promise is a gradual refrigeration, a pro-

cess extending over countless ages, during which the sun's energy goes on exhausting itself. Life therefore must be extinct upon the earth long before ethereal friction compels it to drop into the sun, and consequently long before the "crashing together of defunct suns" which, if natural law prevail, must one day take place. But the Scriptures tell us that excess, not defect, of heat is to be the proximate cause of the grand catastrophe, whether the catastrophe itself is to be confined to the globe we inhabit, or to include the solar system, or to extend to the whole heavens. On the whole, then, it may be said that science only proves the universe not to be immortal: as to whether its death shall be due to natural causes, or what may be termed in judicial language the visitation of God, it can say nothing.

While we are thus compelled to regard the authors' reasonings very dubious as it respects the death of the visible universe, we find equal difficulty in accepting those which relate to the transmutation of the one into the other. They should have stated clearly where they would have us draw the line between the two. The following passage describes the transmutation above referred to, but it does not help us out of this difficulty:—

"Thus we are led to believe that there exists now an invisible order of things intimately connected with the present, and capable of acting energetically upon it—for, in truth, the energy of the present system is to be looked upon as originally derived from the invisible universe.

"Now, is it not natural to imagine that a universe of this nature, which we have reason to think exists, and is connected by bonds of energy with the visible universe, is also capable of receiving energy from it? Whether is it more likely that by far the larger portion of the high-class energy of the universe is travelling outward into space with immense velocity, or that it is gradually transferred into an invisible order of things? May we not regard ether or the medium as not merely a bridge between one portion of the visible universe and another, but also as a bridge between one order of things and another, forming as it were a species of cement, in virtue of which the various orders of the universe are welded together and made one? In fine, what we generally call ether may not be a mere medium, but a medium *plus* the invisible order of things, so that when the motions of the visible universe are transferred into ether, part of them are conveyed as by a bridge into the invisible universe, and are then made use of or stored up. Nay, is it even necessary to retain the conception of a bridge? May we not at once say that when

energy is carried from matter into ether it is carried from the visible into the invisible; and that when it is carried from ether to matter it is carried from the invisible into the visible?"

In this one paragraph we have three distinct conceptions of ether successively introduced:—first, it is the medium between the visible and the invisible worlds; secondly, it is the medium *plus* the invisible world; thirdly, "getting rid of the bridge," it is the invisible world. Yet, all the while, ether must have something to do with the visible universe, for it is the medium through which light, &c. are transmitted, and the cause of the friction that impedes the movements of the planets: it is therefore a part of the physical universe, and adding this to the information previously obtained, we find that ether is the medium between itself and itself. By constituting ether a part of the invisible world, the authors make the distinction between the visible and the invisible in their sense untenable. If ether is a part of the invisible world, the latter is a physical world, nay, it is a material world, like that denominated the visible. For the terms visible and invisible are capable of a looser and a stricter application. In the one they denote the distinction between what is obvious to the senses and what is not: in this sense, ether is among the invisible things. In the other they denote the distinction between spirit and not-spirit: in this sense, ether falls into the other category. It is in fact material, though it has not all the properties of what is called gross matter. It is intangible, imponderable, imperceptible to sight and sound and smell; but its defect in material properties is not total. It has extension, it offers resistance, it is the medium of energy in its passage from one portion to another of gross matter. In any case, its lack of properties material does not confer upon it any title to properties spiritual: it cannot think, or feel, or will. And the assertion that it is fitted to become the vehicle of spirit is an assumption as destitute of proof as that other, that spirit must have some vehicle.

But supposing that we divide the universe into visible and invisible, in accordance with what appears to be the authors' intention—classing in the former human beings, matter, ether, energy, and in the latter spirits, human, angelic and divine, together with ether and energy,—we find that the only difference is in the one the presence of matter, and in the other the presence of spirit uncon-



nected with gross matter; ether and energy being common to both. Now we have to ask, when the visible universe was evolved out of the invisible, what change passed upon that which we now call gross matter? Created of course it was not, since creation is impossible in time. Was it then condensed from ether or some other exquisitely refined substance? If so, did it not truly exist before, only in another form? And, if it existed before, what difference is there between the invisible world before this evolution and the invisible world *plus* the visible after that date? And further we must ask whether this transmutation altered the essential properties of matter? Did the imponderable become ponderable, the intangible tangible, and so forth? And if so, was no breach of continuity chargeable on the intelligence or intelligences who effected the change?

Similar queries crowd upon us when we contemplate the reverse process, the transmutation of the visible into the invisible. This, it is to be supposed, is always going on. Why should the current now be always in that direction? Why should not a stream of energy be always flowing in from the invisible universe, as well as flowing out to it? And if it did, would not the necessity for a collapse be obviated? But if it be said that this is contrary to the facts, do not the facts subvert continuity? For it is admitted that the current did once flow in the direction pointed out. But the time will come when all the energy now possessed by the visible shall have passed over into the invisible, and there will be a great chasm between the two: what will happen then? Either it must remain unfilled, or else be bridged over by a new manifestation of the invisible. If the former, the effete material universe, the vast aggregate of spent suns and defunct systems, must for ever exist, a standing reproach to continuity. If the latter, there is a new turn in the tide, and instead of a living universe side by side with endless stagnation we have something equally incomprehensible, viz., a perpetual seesaw between two oppositely constructed orders of things. Moreover, we may ask, what are the offices of energy in that invisible world to which it is constantly passing? How can it perform any work? Here we see it in constant association with gross matter: in fact, as we have before observed, we see it in no other form than as a function of such matter. How can it operate

apart from that which gives it birth? How can it overcome resistance in a world in which there is no resistance to overcome? How can it illuminate when there is no firmly outlined canvas to reflect its rays, and no delicately adjusted optic nerve to catch its undulations?

But suppose it granted that the energy transmitted from the visible to the invisible universe is there stored up for use by the spirits who tenant it, whether original inhabitants or emigrants from the visible universe, the question arises how they are to dispose of it? We have seen the difficulty of conceiving how energy should operate with no matter less attenuated than the subtlest ether for its *matériel*: we now encounter another, viz., that of comprehending what use spirit should make of energy in like circumstances. Two organisms are propounded to us by the authors as necessary concomitants of life in any sphere,—the one to enable the spirit to act in the present, and the other to enable it to retain a hold upon the past. This perplexes the subject yet more. The organism must consist of the ether which alone retains anything like material substantiality. But all ether is evidently not taken up into organisms, for it is stored in the recesses of the invisible world for the very purpose of being so taken up. Ether then subsists in two forms, the organic and the inorganic. So there is “protoplasm” in the spiritual world as in this gross carnal state, with the difference that the spiritual protoplasm can be elaborated out of that which is not protoplasm, while its earthly prototype demands a basis of previously existing protoplasm in order to its increase. Who does not see that all this is simply an invention of groundless analogies between the visible and spiritual worlds?

Let us imagine it possible for the spirits that tenant the invisible universe to appropriate the energy they once with too great prodigality bestowed upon the visible, and to employ it in the organisms that connect them with the present. There remains the difficulty of showing how the same or a similar organism should connect them with the past. The account given by our authors is as follows:—“All memory consists in an investiture of present resources in order to keep a hold upon the past. We have seen that this medium—this ether—has the power of transmitting motion from one part of the universe to the other. A pic-

ture of the sun may be said to be travelling through space with an inconceivable velocity, and, in fact, continual photographs of all occurrences are thus produced and retained. A large portion of the energy of the universe may be said to be invested in such pictures." A new reason this why bad men should literally work in the dark: pictures of each transaction that takes place in broad daylight will be transmitted to the invisible world: if darkness cover them, that mischief will not follow! But this is not our point: the question is, how such pictures can be aids to memory. Certainly, to each man individually, pictures of each transaction he has had a share in would be a considerable help, but not in any other case: every scene whose actors he did not recognise, whatever information it might convey, would not affect his memory, for in memory recognition is the essential point. And though such facilities were afforded, which among the inhabitants of the invisible world would care to make use of them? Not the blessed, for they would find better employment than poring over the mistakes and follies of their earthly life. Not the lost, for they would be unwilling to aggravate their torments by more vivid realisations of abused opportunities than those derived from their own consciousness. The whole scheme of a memory of the visible universe preserved in the invisible by means of ethereal pictures seems as purposeless as it is visionary.

When we pass from the instruments to the agents in these wonderful transformations, our difficulties thicken. Who are the agents? Angelic intelligences are acknowledged to people these shadowy realms: have they any part in the agency which first builds the visible universe out of the invisible, and then reconstructs the invisible out of the visible? If so, how or when did they come into being? Were they created or developed? If developed, what was the primordial germ from which they sprang? If created, was it in time or in eternity? The same questions must be put in the case of spirits now imprisoned in dungeons of flesh and blood. Creation in time seems here the only admissible alternative: but if the creation of matter is impossible in time, so *à fortiori*, we should suppose, must be the still more stupendous act of the creation of mind. Similar inquiries would press upon us were we to advance to the consideration of the daring speculations the authors indulge in respecting the action on the universe, visible

and invisible, of the Second and Third Persons in the Trinity. But reverence forbids.

A false notion of what is due to the dignity and excellence of the Divine nature lies at the bottom of these wild imaginings. God is regarded as very far off: His ways are far above, out of our sight. The invisible universe must intervene between us and Him, and be placed under the government of a Being who is at once conditioned and unconditioned too. Thus the gulf between the finite and the infinite is bridged over, and the principle of continuity so exemplified will pervade every manifestation of being. Everything will be found connected with what went before it in a manner perfectly comprehensible to finite intelligence: the conditioned must contain no mystery, only the unconditioned. But by the adoption of the principle of continuity in this narrow and impracticable sense, the authors create difficulties greater than any they are called upon to explain. Admit the possible action of God within His own universe, and you accept a mystery, but it is one which solves all others. Continuity is not thereby wholly destroyed even in the authors' sense: it is permitted a limited range, viz., the sphere of natural law. But even where continuity in this sense is violated, a higher continuity is maintained. The universe, with all its shifting scenes, is only a means to an end. The true continuity is not that of the means, but that of the end. All else is fluctuating: here alone stability is found. The visible universe is constructed as the theatre for moral manifestations: its scenes shift according to the needs of the actors in it: they pass away when the work is done. Admit the preponderance of moral motives in the government of the universe, and this highest form of continuity is established. There is only one way in which God promises to preserve His creatures from permanent intellectual confusion: it is by their recognition as supreme over all interests, physical, intellectual and moral too, of the "eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ."

We could wish that the object contemplated by the authors of this book might in some degree be furthered, viz., the reconciliation of men of science to the tenets of Christianity. But except as showing that their own principles, apart from supernatural illumination, must land them in contradiction, we fear this will not be accomplished. The value of the book, where not purely scientific, is

simply negative: its positive value, as an aid to faith, is nil. The Christianity its teaching would support, is not Christianity: the miracles it professes to believe in are not the Christian miracles: the resurrection it allows to be possible is not the Christian resurrection: the Christ of its speculations is not the Christ of God. Nevertheless, we have a deep sympathy with the authors in their aims, as well as a sincere respect for their power of patient, profound scientific research; and in their next volume, we wish them greater success.

---

- ART. IV.—1. *The Brighton Convention and its Doctrinal Teaching. Testimony of Evangelical Leaders, including the Letters of Dean McNeile, Dean Close, Canon Ryle, Canon Bell, Rev. G. T. Fox, and the Rev. Dr. Horatius Bonar.* London: Nisbet. 1875.
2. *Modern Doctrines respecting Sinlessness considered.* By BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON. Houlston and Sons. 1873.
3. *Perfectionism.* By Rev. G. TOWNSHEND FOX, M.A., Durham. London: W. Hunt and Co.
4. *Perfectionism; or, the Higher Christian Life. An Unscriptural and Soul-deceiving Doctrine.* By C. HEMINGTON. London: Gadsby. 1875.
5. *Out of Darkness into Light; or, The Hidden Life made Manifest, through facts of observation and experience: facts elucidated by the Word of God.* By Rev. ASA MAHAN, D.D. Wesleyan Conference Office. 1875.
6. *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost.* By Rev. ASA MAHAN, D.D. New York: W. C. Palmer. 1870.

It does not come within our province to discuss the history, secret and known, of the two religious movements which have simultaneously excited the wonder of England, it might almost be said of the whole world. Both originated in America. Both have produced effects, seemingly deep and permanent, on a vaster scale than we have been lately accustomed to witness. Both, as we write, may be said to be in full vigour. Though entirely unconnected they may be brought into some kind of relation with each other; inasmuch as the one is apparently a mighty assault upon the masses who are strangers to personal religion, and the other an equally mighty appeal to the religious who live below the privileges of the Christian estate: the one in fact aiming to convert the indifferent, the other to bring the converted to a higher religious life.



It is with the latter we have to do in these pages ; and with that only in a very limited relation. We must postpone any examination of the theological principles of the movement until the authentic report of the Brighton Convention is published. Meanwhile, we may with propriety take a preliminary glance at the question as it is polemically considered in some of the treatises mentioned above. Their avowed testimony against what they call heresy, is of great importance, as the names of the writers show. We have carefully read their allegations and complaints, and may reduce them to two classes : first, those which condemn the general theology of the heads of the movement as unsound, or mystical, or contradictory ; secondly, those which attack their specific principles as to the crisis which they strive to bring into the religious life, and as to the nature of the religious life to which it introduces. The crisis is generally known as the Baptism of the Spirit, and the Perfect Consecration, and the Second Blessing ; the state that follows is that of the Higher Life, or Entire Sanctification, or Perfect Union with God.

Some of these topics of transcendent interest we hope to discuss hereafter. But in the observations now to be made we shall limit ourselves to the attack on the teaching of the Brighton Convention by the "Evangelical Leaders." We shall have to defend our American friends from many of the charges ; and should be very glad if that were the extent of our duty. But, sincere as is our sympathy with them, we must in all fidelity indicate where, in our judgment, their opponents have the advantage. It is scarcely necessary to add that it is our sense of duty which compels us to admit so sacred a subject into our journal ; and we shall take care to treat it as alone it may be treated in such pages as these.

The tone of this "Testimony" against the theological principles of the movement is on the whole very fair. If Mr. Pearsall Smith is disseminating such pernicious error as these eminent writers attribute to him they do well to be angry with the teacher and his teaching. Angry with him they undoubtedly are, and can hardly restrain their wrath, as we shall see. It will do no good to discuss the quality of the temper displayed in the controversy. But there is something remarkable in the fact that those who detest the theology of one class of Americans are greatly delighted with that of the other, namely that of the Moody

and Sankey movement. If the comparison occurred only once or twice, or were only a fleeting one, it would scarcely deserve notice. But it is introduced in such a manner as to suggest the inquiry for some fundamental reason which makes the one more palatable than the other. For instance, Dean Close writes :—

“In the parallel but far more influential efforts of Messrs. Moody and Sankey not a speck or particle of unsound doctrine has been discovered. There is an equal, if not a greater, development of the mighty energy of God’s Spirit ; but God’s Word has been more prominently taught, the emotions have been more restrained, and subjugated by sound doctrine. The Spirit of God has borne thousands along with an irresistible impulse, but the truth of God’s Word—the straight lines of His truth—have never been left, or their guidance suspended.

“Moreover, their object has not been to bring to the front some one theory, dogma or sentiment—which this higher notion of holiness undoubtedly is—but to exhibit the grand revelations of God’s truth in and by His holy word in their due proportions. Mr. Moody is not a Paganini, producing startling effects by playing on one string—but he thrusts his hand over David’s harp and brings out the solemn sounds and lovely melodies and harmonies, which a Scriptural combination of all the words which “proceed out of the mouth of God” alone can produce. Wisdom, prudence, caution, are needed much in both of these extraordinary movements ; and above all *truth*, the whole truth and nothing but the truth—not with the ten thousand interpretations of Mr. P. Smith—but in that simplicity, fidelity, and loving faithfulness which has riveted and chained, and, as we hope, profited and saved many of the thousands who have listened to the utterances of Messrs. Moody and Sankey.”

The faithfulness of this picture—especially that part which refers to the “one string” and “the scriptural combination of all the words, &c.”—must be left to the reader. Undoubtedly the Dean would have been more just if he had commended both companies for dwelling each on its one great topic. That, indeed, has been the secret of their success : one band avowedly bringing sinners directly to Christ for salvation ; the other avowedly bringing believers to entire consecration. They would have failed if they had professed to offer revival discourses and series of lectures, whether on conversion or on sanctification. We venture to think that both systems of teaching have suffered to some extent from the lack of that

"scriptural combination" which Dean Close misses in Mr. P. Smith and rejoices over in Mr. Moody.

The *Record*, also, in its summary of the strength of the evidence against Mr. Pearsall Smith's "confused and confusing theology," brings in Mr. Moody himself as joining the chorus:—

"From Scotland, Dr. Horatius Bonar, one of the most zealous supporters of Messrs. Moody and Sankey's movement, has, in his recent valuable publication, *The Rent Veil*, sounded another note of warning, strong and clear; just as Mr. Spurgeon had done before with short but incisive Scriptural logic, in his own clear Saxon English. Even so late as Friday last, Mr. Moody, in the Opera House, in a striking address on the lifelong warfare between the flesh and the spirit, conveyed, without naming anyone, a pungent rebuke to those who flatter themselves that they have got out of 'the miserable Seventh of Romans,' and are complacently basking in the sunshine of the closing verses of the Eighth chapter. Mr. Moody quaintly added that if their course was watched, it would be found that such boasters often required to be sent back to the beginning of the chapter they disdained as inapplicable to their own exalted notions of their attainments."

Here is, after all, the pith of the controversy. Mr. Moody held the traditional Calvinistic interpretation of Romans vii., and Mr. Pearsall Smith does not hold it. The former, as multitudes know, has a method of describing the contest between the old man and the new in the regenerate which, to say the least of it, is more grotesque than profound. The latter has a method of describing it which is certainly not a happy one, and will, we believe, give place to a better. We have no desire to pursue the comparison between the two teachers. Judging by what we find in the extracts before us, neither is a theologian to be implicitly trusted; perhaps neither lays claim to the name of a theologian at all. We can appreciate the enthusiasm of Canon Ryle: "But one thing I do know. I can thoroughly understand the theology of Moody and Sankey, and go along with it entirely. I praise God for the 'sound speech which cannot be condemned,' which is daily falling from their lips, and I pray God to bless them. . . At any rate Moody's teaching is not misunderstood. The difference between his theology and that of the 'Oxford Conference,' is the difference between sunshine and a fog. Was it not in a fog that the great steamship, *Schiller*, lately made shipwreck?" The simple fact is that Mr. Moody is a

Calvinist and Mr. Pearsall Smith is not. The clearness and simplicity and directness of the former are sometimes and on some subjects much to be commended. But, unless we are greatly mistaken, his clearness is, on the question of the preparation for coming to Christ, as perilous in its way as the mystical fog that is so much deplored in the other American. Both would be much improved by a course of dogmatic and exegetical theology. However, we have to do with the company guiding the theology of the Brighton Convention; and they are condemned, first, for general looseness of statement, secondly, for semi-Pelagianism, and thirdly, for mysticism.

As to the first we cannot altogether defend our clients. They are not always exact on theological statement; they are not always precise in their exegesis; and they are sometimes inconsistent with themselves and with each other. In saying "with each other" we must explain, and in such a way as to some extent to vindicate those who are mainly responsible. Mr. Pearsall Smith is the centre of a large number of co-workers of all churches, English, Scotch, German, French, and Swiss; and it would obviously be very unfair to hold him accountable for all the expositions of Scripture which the zeal and enthusiasm of the godly men around him may give. Moreover, it is not fair to take even authorised reports of newspapers, and make them the basis of a charge. And it is not Christian to exaggerate the occasional errors that are manifest, as is done by the venerable Dr. Bonar:—

"One thing has struck me sadly in the authorised reports of the Brighton Conference,—the number of perverted passages of Scripture; and this is really the root of the whole evil. The speakers first disclaim, I might say, deride theology, and then they proceed to distort the Word of God. I was grieved beyond measure to see my dear friend so sadly perverting the words of Hezekiah, 'undertake for me.' Surely he must have been misreported, and yet these perversions are part of the system. It cannot stand without them."

This is very hard. The "esteemed gentleman" whom the Rev. Mr. Bell further instructs as to Hezekiah's meaning probably knew it as well as his critics. He was incautious in following up "an expression which occurred to him as suited to teach the same lesson." "Undertake for me! keep me out of sight; put a covering on me, keep me

under ground!" This would, certainly, have been a "curious interpretation," but doubtless it was not given as an interpretation. Now when Mr. Bonar and the others quote the Scriptures we sometimes think they also "pervert" them. This is not stated in the way of recrimination, but as matter of honest criticism. For instance, Dr. Bonar speaks of what we are now considering, that is, the confluence of multitudes thirsting for holiness, as the "beginning of those 'strong delusions' which God is to send in the last days." Let anyone go to the passage 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12, and read it: he will think this, unless we much mistake, a "perversion" again. Rom. vii. is perverted, and St. Paul pronounced a backslider in writing it, because that solemn chapter gives the death-blow to the theory of Perfectionism. We hold that Dr. Bonar as much perverts the Scripture as even Mr. Pearsall Smith; both, however, are only under a pious mistake. "Offences will come; but woe to him by whom the offence cometh:" to apply this to men whose one supreme object is to glorify Christ by bringing His people to perfect death to self in His presence is, we humbly think, perversion of Scripture. "I can only appeal to the Good Shepherd—Wilt thou allow thy sheep to be thus scattered?" this is perversion of Scripture. "Unstable souls beguiled;" this also has much the same character. "St. Paul had got quit of much sin, yet it was not in this that he gloried, but in no condemnation. He did not venture to say that he loved the Lord with all his heart, for he knew too well what some of us have yet to learn, what that love means, and what that heart is. Instead of speaking of 'being freed from internal opposition,' as Mr. Smith affirms he is, he said, 'We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened.' He was not beyond the burden and the groan, as some now profess to be. Nay, he says, 'We who have the first fruits of the Spirit groan within ourselves,' as if the groan became the deeper in proportion to being filled with the Spirit." Now this misapplication of the profound word "groan" is—especially when we remember our Master's sighs and groans—simple perversion of Scripture. Every time we read in these Testimonies the apostle's words to the Galatians "so that ye CANNOT do the things that ye would"—and again and again, of course, that passage is held up in warning—we feel that here is perversion of Scripture: innocent in those that know not the original, very suspicious in those who

do. However, in spite of our protest, this seems very much like reprisals on our part: but for that consideration we could furnish many more instances.

In consenting to this charge, however modified, against the American promoters of Scriptural holiness, we feel that we concur in a serious condemnation. Every statement of Christian duty and experience must be amenable to the plain dicta of Scripture, interpreted in the light of the best appliances of learning. It would be foolish to be so severe as to say that no text may be used save in its truest form as determined by criticism, and its surest meaning as determined by unanimous exposition. Such an overstrained canon would retrospectively damage much past theology, and lay an intolerable restraint on much of the theology now current. Moreover, the Holy Ghost has not always limited His meaning to that one which obviously lies on the surface. But, after every qualification, the principle holds good that every great and glorious doctrine should rest upon its own clear and unmistakable text. What we mean may be illustrated by another sentence of Dr. Bonar:—

“One of my chief objections to the Perfectionist Doctrine is that it subverts the whole argument and scope of the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews. It takes the key-note from both. The key-word of the former is righteousness, the key-note of the latter is ‘perfection;’ judicial righteousness in the former, sanctuary or sacrificial perfection in the latter. The words death and life, dead and living, sanctify, consecrate, cleanse, perfect, have all changed their meaning in Perfectionist writings.”

Now there is no doubt that there is too much truth in this charge as it respects some of the writers before us. That is deeply to be regretted. But it is not the case with all who advocate Christian Perfection: notably it is not the case in Mr. Wesley’s writings and some of the best of those of his successors in teaching Methodist theology. Dr. Bonar does not think proper to add St. John’s epistle. In them there is a righteousness which is not purely “judicial:” in his sense, that is—in the true sense all righteousness is judicial. In them there is a “cleansing” and there is a “perfection” of love, namely, which is not purely sacrificial. Moreover, exact discrimination will find that in the Romans there is a righteousness which is more than “imputed:” the righteousness of the law is



"fulfilled in us," and "love is the fulfilling of the law." And in the Hebrews there is a perfection that is more than sacrificial, that of the "saints made perfect." In fact we all, on both sides, and one side as much as the other, need to exercise more care in the analysis and arrangement of the phraseology of these doctrines. The terms that belong to the law-court, to the household, and to the sanctuary, of Christianity respectively, ought to be much more carefully discriminated than they are. And we venture to say that if this were done the doctrine of Christian Perfection—as pertaining to all these three ranges—would shine out in irresistible glory.

The catalogue of offences against sound exegesis is a very large one. A few specimens are all that can be now given; specimens, however, that are important in their theological bearing. Some fanciful, erroneous, or merely allusive expositions, which wander from the direct line of interpretation, may be passed by; they are made much more of than they deserve in this controversy. Mr. Boardman is responsible for the first:—

"The monstrous absurdity, that in every child of God there are two irreconcilable personalities,—the old man and the new man, perpetually at war with each other; the old man sinful and the new man holy,—hard at it in an undying battle, to cease only when death shall come in and end the fight. Oh, is it not amazing that out of such stuff as this Satan can build up a stronghold of contentment in sin?"

Mr. Boardman is an honest and good man; but his taste is defective, and his exposition does not serve his cause. It would, indeed, be a monstrous doctrine that in the regenerate there are two irreconcilable "personalities:" he is but one person, but in the mystery of the religious life that one person has two natures, one of which opposes the other in a failing contest. The "undying battle" we reject as firmly as Mr. Boardman does; we do not believe, any more than he does, that death comes in to declare the battle a drawn one; and that the separation of soul and body alone finishes the contest. What follows, however, is more grave:—

"The wrath of God against sin, as declared in the first of Romans, had been heavy upon me ten years before; but now the bondage of sin, as illustrated in the seventh of Romans, was

heavier still, and I experienced the full bitterness of soul which rings out the cry, 'Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?' But when the Lord led me into rest of heart for sanctification, how sweet it was! Oh, what a revelation was that to me when, in the very name of Jesus,—so called because He did save His people from their sins,—His office as my Emancipator from sin was embodied. Oh, how my soul was gladdened with assurance that the work would be done, that I should be purified unto God and made zealous of good works, and should be kept by the power of God, and presented faultless before the throne in the great day! Henceforth, in this matter my soul was at rest, and a sweet peace flowed in upon me and overflowed me."

All this follows the strange assertion that "Forgiveness did not satisfy me; I wanted the dominion of sin destroyed. Purification, not less than pardon, I saw to be required. I became thoroughly awakened to my own wretched bondage to sin." Now here the plain scriptural account of the dominion of the Spirit of Christ in the regenerate over all sin is altogether forgotten; the presence of sin and the bondage of sin are made equivalent terms; and the whole series of passages which describe the estate of regeneration as freedom from the law of sin and death are robbed of their plain meaning. Then, again, purification and pardon are distinguished as they are never distinguished in Scripture: whatever purification means in the New Testament is invariably connected with forgiveness, and not reserved as a second blessing. Hence the difficulty of Mr. Pearsall Smith's exegesis in the following account:—

"In my despair my eye rested on the words, 'purifying their hearts by faith.' How my soul leaped at these words, as in a moment I saw the possibility of my deliverance '*by faith.*' 'If, then,' I exclaimed, 'it is by faith, I will trust Jesus for a pure heart and *now.*' And with the act of faith there distilled into my heart, like the gentle dew, the sweet consciousness of the presence and power of Jesus; and since then to me to live has been Christ in a different sense and power than I had ever known before: obedience—full-hearted obedience—became then, and is now, the easy yoke that my Lord promised.

"Temptation comes to me more fiercely than ever before; but temptation is not sin. There is, moreover, now this difference: that temptation finds me within my armour and behind the shield of faith, so that it is my privilege to quench, not some, but *all* the fiery darts of the wicked one. It seems as though temptation is now from without, rather than from my own heart."

The pure heart, for which the penitent believer trusts in Christ, is no other than the removal of his guilt, translated into sacrificial language. That there is a deeper and more thorough purification promised is undoubted; but in the passage quoted by Mr. Pearsall Smith, it is not this interior cleaning that is referred to. Doubtless the Divine Spirit is not limited to texts. He blessed the act of faith in Christ as able to save from internal impurity: that is, as able and willing to give pardon and sanctification to the conscience, renewal and perfect victory over sin to the consciousness. But the exegesis underlying this crisis is not perfectly sound. Rather, the faith of the petitioner put more into the passage than it meant; and in this case, as in a thousand others, the passage expanded to meet the application. It was done according to the faith; and the purification, which meant no more than that the Gentiles were rendered acceptable to God by faith even as the Jews were, became an interior change—in fact, all that he who speaks of it obtained. Now, in the light of this admission, let us examine Dr. Bonar's allusion:—

"Have I written too strongly? I don't think so. Years are now upon me, and I may claim to be entitled to speak; and if not listened to, at least to have this as my testimony before God and the Churches, that I know few errors more subversive of what the Bible really teaches, and of what our fathers of the Reformation died for, than this modern Perfectionism. The thing now called holiness is not that which we find in Scripture, and the method of reaching holiness, by an instantaneous leap, called an act of faith, is nowhere taught us by the Holy Ghost."

If Dr. Bonar had said that Christian perfection is not attained by an instantaneous act of faith, he would have delivered his assault more intelligibly. That is a matter open to further consideration. The old doctrine to which we have been accustomed does not assert this. It declares that a secret and sacred discipline precedes what must, like every other blessing of the Spirit, be received by faith. But it knows nothing of an instantaneous leap. And it does not call this Christian perfection so much as entire sanctification. Now Dr. Bonar ought not, on his own principles, to deny that sanctification is attained by faith. In his theology it is simply the deliverance of the conscience from the guilt of sin, viewed as a stain that disqualifies for the altar. But he says that "the method of

reaching holiness, by an instantaneous leap, called an act of faith, is nowhere taught us by the Holy Ghost." Yet God "puts no difference between us and them, purifying, or sanctifying, or rendering holy their hearts by faith." We confess that we prefer Dr. Bonar's interpretation of the sacrificial word "purifying" to Mr. Pearsall Smith's. But he ought not to deny that holiness, as meaning the consecration of what was before unholy to God, is imparted to faith. We go further and say—though in that text it is not found—that an entire sanctification from all sin is attained also by faith at a later stage. If Mr. Pearsall Smith seemed to anticipate it, his error was a venial one, and as he tells us—for we do not believe that he is under a boundless delusion—he enjoyed the benefit.

We have abstained from saying that the Americans have erred because they have not always been faithful to the formularies of the Churches. Undoubtedly they ought to regulate their teaching by the acknowledged standards of Christendom. They indeed profess to remain faithful to these; and, until their authorised account appears, and the revised edition of their leading books, it seems better to suspend judgment on this point. But here the Rev. C. Bell, of Cheltenham, may speak:—

"There is one sentence, however, on which I would dwell for a little; it is this: 'Not a single dogma of faith varying from simple, well-known evangelical standards is propounded, but rather the old standards are emphasised and vitalised.' Is this inserted to catch the unwary? Is it true, when compared with the published opinions of the chairman as gathered from his books? The teaching of Mr. Smith's books has been proved to be unscriptural and dangerous, and to be at variance with all evangelical standards, by the Rev. G. T. Fox, by Mr. Benjamin W. Newton, by Mr. Grant, editor of the *Christian Standard*, and by other writers. These reviewers have shown that God's truth has been assailed, His sovereignty impugned, man's freewill exalted, and God's discriminating grace dishonoured by Mr. P. Smith, Mr. Boardman, and other contributors to the *Christian's Pathway of Power*. Whether nakedly taught or not, 'perfectionism' is the key-note of the whole of Mr. Smith's system, and is insisted on in *Holiness by Faith*, where such statements as these are found: 'The natural will, being dead, the agony of a divided life and purpose is gone; for our glorious motive power—God's own will—works in us, freed from internal opposition.' And we are told that it is possible for Christians to 'walk in newness of life without the taint upon us of corruption now buried in the

grave.' The inspired teaching of St. Paul in the seventh of Romans is called 'miserable experience,' and the apostle is spoken of as 'falling from grace and coming under the law in his practical ways.' The conflict between the old nature and the new is elegantly denounced by Mr. Boardman as 'stuff.' How, then, I ask, can an invitation to a convention for the promotion of 'Holiness' contain, amongst other statements, one so incorrect as this: 'Not a single dogma of faith, varying from simple well-known evangelical standards is propounded, but rather the old standards are emphasised and vitalised.' I ask again, was this sentence inserted to catch the unwary? Do not the standards of the Church of England declare that 'the infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated,' and that 'the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit'?"

Now, it might be said, that modern theology is not bound to maintain fidelity to any standards which are ambiguous; and certainly is not bound to adhere to either side of an alternative allowed by the standards in question. There are very many Arminians, or, as they are called here, Semi-Pelagians, who subscribe *ex animo* to the Thirty-nine Articles. They accept the words which declare that "this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in the regenerate; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God;" for they do not find themselves committed to the doctrine that the insubjection to the law of God is necessarily to continue to the end. The infection of nature doth remain; but it is not said that it doth always remain, nor are the terms describing it taken from the seventh of the Romans. It is true that the Westminster Confession is much less tractable. No subscriber to that stern formulary can ever entertain such views as are taught by the theology in question. This representative of Calvinism binds those who hold it down to the gloomy belief that there is no perfect redemption till death. These are its words:—

"They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by His word and Spirit dwelling in them; the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified; and they more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving

graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

"This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, *yet imperfect in this life*; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part; whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.

"In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome; and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Mr. Ryle declines to discuss the meaning and application of the seventh chapter of the Romans. But he makes a very hasty assertion, which might frighten controversialists less familiar with the literature of this vexed question:—

"Arminians, Socinians, and Pelagians, no doubt, have always maintained that it does not describe the experience of an established believer. Nevertheless, the greatest divines in every age since the Reformation have steadily and continuously maintained that it is a literal, perfect, accurate, correct photograph of the experience of every true saint of God. I will not weary your readers with names of writers who hold this view. I simply remark that I have never yet seen any reply to the arguments contained in such books as *Owen on Indwelling Sin*, *Burgess on Original Sin*, *Elton on Romans*, *Stafford on Seventh of Romans*, and *Haldane's Commentary on Romans*. The advocates of the new theology would do well to abstain from scoffing and jeering language on this solemn subject, and to consider seriously what these books contain, and answer their arguments if they can."

Were it necessary we could show that the champions of another exposition are in much better company than "Arminians, Socinians, and Pelagians." But we are no more obliged than Mr. Ryle is to discuss the seventh of Romans. It is enough to give contradiction for contradiction. The very best expositors, those who are best armed with the best resources, do not find a perfect description of every saint in that chapter. We venture to say that the formularies of the Church of England, taken as a whole, do not. Mr. Ryle appeals to the Confession in the Communion Service: he does not appeal to the prayer that "we may perfectly love thee." Some of the best commentators have been so pressed by some terms employed by St. Paul, that they have been driven to a compromise.



At the risk of tediousness, we must in illustration quote some words of Dr. Vaughan's admirable exposition.

"The *nous* is the natural mind, the understanding and reason; able to pass an approving judgment upon the beauty and holiness of the Divine Law, but itself requiring renewal by the Holy Spirit in order to turn approval into obedience. See ch. xii. 2, 'transformed by the renewing of your mind.' In Eph. iv. 17 the heathen are said to walk 'in the vanity of their mind,' given up (Rom. i. 28) to 'a reprobate mind.' Elsewhere corrupters of the faith are described as '... men having the mind and conscience defiled' (Tit. i. 15). In Col. ii. 18 we read of the mind belonging to the flesh, debased by the influence of sense, and running into a self-confident and unauthorised speculation. On the other hand, in Eph. iv. 23, Christians are charged to be gradually renewed in the spirit of their mind: that is, in the spiritual part of their rational nature; the part lost in Adam and recovered in Christ. Still, even in Christian people, the mind is distinguishable from the spirit, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 14: 'My spirit prayeth, but my mind is unfruitful.'"

We mar our quotation by omitting the Greek. But he who follows out the hint here given will come to the conclusion that the absence of "spirit" in Rom. vii. indicates plainly enough that the apostle is not speaking of himself as having undergone the change which would enable him to speak of "the spirit of his mind." And this is clearly confirmed by a comparison of Gal. v., where, indisputably, the contest in the regenerate is referred to. There it is no longer the "mind" that admires the law but is in bondage to the flesh; it is "the Spirit of God," inhabiting the spirit to which His presence gives existence, that "lusteth against the flesh." Dr. Vaughan has not marked this most important change; had he marked it, or marking it,—for it cannot have escaped him—had he followed it out, he would hardly have written the hesitating note which follows: a note that seems to meet a difficulty, but really involves mischievous consequences both dogmatic and exegetical.

"'Oh, wretched man that I am!' The words, in their full bitterness, are those of the man not yet emancipated by Christ. But the line cannot be drawn absolutely: (1) because of the infection of nature remaining in the regenerate (Art. IX.), and causing a continual experience of conflict and imperfection; (2) because of the unredeemed condition of the body in this life."

Reference is then made, as by Dr. Bonar above, to the groaning of the eighth chapter and of the Corinthian epistle.

But surely it is enough to say that the redemption expected in the resurrection was not that for which the apostle thanked God through Jesus Christ, and in which the next chapter exults. Had Mr. Pearsall Smith remembered the Galatian chapter—which undeniably refers to the painful conflict between the regenerate spirit and the residue of the fleshly nature—he would not have written that unfortunate account of St. Paul's lapse which the seventh of Romans describes. We have not read his words, save as they are quoted in the pages of his censors. But they seem to have excited much bitterness; and we hope the result of further reflection will be his acceptance of the theory that the apostle is describing in Rom. vii. his struggles with himself as under the grace of conviction, and in Gal. v. the struggles of all regenerate Christians until the crucifixion of their flesh has been consummated in death. Mr. Ryle's appeal to those who mock and jibe is full as strong as the occasion required. Mr. Boardman seems to have been the only offender. And we feel disposed to apologise for the vehemence of a man who is defending the high and awful character of a believer united to Christ from the impeachment of being "sold under sin" if utterly unable to do the good that he would do. The language in Gal. v. is very different: the utmost it says is that the mutual opposition between flesh and spirit is "that ye should not do the things that ye would." But in that case it is the spirit which is free, and the flesh is impaled on the cross, sinking into death.

The theology concerning sanctification which has been taught in England for a long time differs as much from the one party as from the other. The seventh chapter of the Romans is not a description of the lifelong experience of the saint; it is not a "photograph" of the believer's character. Nor is it a description of a state into which St. Paul had relapsed, as Mr. Pearsall Smith has rashly averred. There is nothing in the account which may not be explained on the theory of a certain preliminary grace of religious conviction which is as much beyond the condition of simple nature as it is below that of the full regenerate life. The New Testament view of the life of godliness gives much prominence to the spiritual life which precedes the regenerate. It does not, as we think, sanction the notion that regeneration is the beginning of the good work of the Divine Spirit in the human soul: nor, indeed,

the beginning of that work in it. The temple has its outer court—its court of the Gentiles—still; and there the Holy Ghost carries on a work of preparation which is not life but unto life. To distinguish between that work of the Spirit in the minds of some heathen without the gospel and in the hearts of those who are convinced by the truth, is difficult, and it is not necessary. Wherever and by whatever means the mind is brought to perceive the beauty and the claims of the law, and to mourn over its inability to keep it and to dread the consequences of its violation, there is the prison-house of Romans vii. The transition from that state to the full life of the filial confidence in God may be more sudden and abrupt, or more gradual and insensible. But there must be at some crisis that quickening of the spirit by the Holy Ghost which restores the filial character and relation. After that there is a continuous growth and conflict, as in Gal. v., which is to the regenerate life what Rom. vii. is to the unregenerate: the crisis of perfect redemption from the carnal mind being somewhat analogous to the former, though not so clearly described in the New Testament for obvious reasons.

These points must be, however, considered more fully. At present it is enough to say that the "new theology," as our censors delight to call it, does very seriously expose itself to misconception through its lack of systematic coherence and completeness. A certain consciousness of this seems sometimes to disturb the equanimity of the teachers, and tempts them to speak disparagingly of dogmatic theology and theological psychology. This is a mistake. If these doctrines are of God they will be found to harmonise with the confessions and formularies and standards of the evangelical churches, or some of them: if not with those of the Reformed or Calvinistic type, yet with those of the Lutheran and Arminian. And, if they are sound they must be in accordance with the principles and laws of the human mind, and the acknowledged constitution of human nature.

It is not to be expected, of course, that the leaders of a movement, which has but one aim, to revive and spread scriptural holiness, should publish to the world their precise creed, and announce their exact latitude and longitude on the chart of the evangelical confessions. The American Revivalists who have visited England during the last half century, have generally been careful to disavow any connection with denominations and communions. And those

with whom we now have to do are faithful to the tradition. But there are limits which, for their own sake, and the prosperity of their work, they should be careful not to transgress. If they work, as it seems they do, on the principle of keeping out of view everything that might raise the question of sectarian differences, they should be all the more careful on that account to lay great emphasis on the cardinal principles of the Christian faith, and not suffer themselves to lie under the imputation of grave error. It may be well to ignore for a season, if need be, the formalities of worship, and ritual, and sacraments; but much care should be taken to show how important an element in the furtherance of the life of sanctification is the sacramental and other communion of the Church. It may be well to efface for a season, if need be, the distinction of pastorship and laity. On the ground that these are special and extraordinary services, there can be no objection to this; but there should be all the more pains taken to show how closely, in the ordinary course of things, the increase of the body is bound up with the appointed ministers of the Church. It is perfectly right to appeal to the will of every member of Christ's body as capable of responding to every claim of the Gospel; but there is a way of doing this which shall keep clear of the possibility of being charged with Pelagianism or even semi-Pelagianism. Now this last charge is brought by almost all the censors against the movement. We do not adopt it; we are not examining directly either the books or the addresses of Mr. Pearsall Smith. But we see plainly enough, by the extracts before us, that sufficient care is not always taken to preclude the very possibility of the imputation of Pelagianism. It is evident, sometimes, that a generous disdain of conventions, when immortal interests are at stake, is carried much too far.

"For, as sight is only seeing, so faith is only believing. And as the only necessary thing about seeing is that you see the thing as it is, so the only necessary thing about believing is that you believe the thing as it is. The virtue does not lie in your believing, but in the thing you believe. If you believe the truth you are saved; if you believe a lie, you are lost. The believing in both cases is the same; the things believed in are exactly opposite, and it is this which makes the mighty difference."

"Just so now, having believed on the fact of Christ's death to sin, you must reckon yourself as having, in and with Christ, also

died to sin. Say it in your soul, say it aloud, assert it against your consciousness, against every suggestion of unbelief, and *find it true* according to the utmost range of the exercise of your faith."

These two sentences are separately, and together, a singular challenge to theology. The former gives such a view of the faith which obtains the most transcendent blessing, as reduces it to a mere intellectual and desperately determined act of the mind. It is the freest Pelagianism in its tone. The latter is, in some respects, the exact opposite. It makes the believer appropriate a death to sin which Christ never underwent for us, certainly not for Himself. The reader has only to weigh the sentences well to feel that they are essentially wrong, and that the writer's experience is much sounder than his theology. The reader must also judge whether the following sentence much mends the matter. Certainly it shows that the Pelagianism is avoided whenever the writer is careful to avoid it. That ought to be always; for there is no error comparable to Pelagianism.

"Do you not see that in taking up this position, that you have no faith and cannot believe, you are not only 'making God a liar,' but you are also manifesting an utter want of confidence in the Spirit? For He is always ready to help our infirmities. We never have to wait for Him,—He is always waiting for us. And I, for my part, have such absolute confidence in the Blessed Holy Ghost, and in His being always ready to do His work, that I dare to say to every one of you that you *can* believe now, at this very moment, and that, if you do not, it is not the Spirit's fault but your own."

It ought to be remembered by the severe critics that all these words are addressed to Christians, who are supposed to have a measure of the Spirit's influence. We were going to say to regenerate Christians; but we hardly know what they are in this theology. We cannot defend the insistence on an act of faith that in Christ, and *with Christ*, we all died to the power of sin: we died in Him judicially, and obtain the life-giving Spirit of His resurrection to save us from the power of sin. There is some confusion in the theology here. Another sentence seems to correct the great error just mentioned:—

"There is a wonderful distinction between the pardon of sin and eternal life. They are ever connected, and yet the Divine

order is pardon, healing, life. The Blessed God never gives life until sin is put away. The question of sin settled, the soul is then fitted to receive God's unspeakable gift."

Now it will be no more than just to give our Censors' antidote to Mr. P. Smith's Pelagianism:—

"Is, then, the Holy Spirit, who by His personal indwelling unites believers to Christ, and communicates His grace to them, free and sovereign in His working on the new nature, and in the bestowal or withdrawal of His own gracious influences? We have already anticipated an answer in the affirmative, and thereby *the whole foundation* of this heresy is destroyed. We have already seen the testimony of Scripture . . . that the operations, gifts, and graces are dispensed by the Spirit in a sovereign manner—as *He will*. Manton's words are: 'God's grace is free, and His holy leisure must be waited. Grace is not at our beck' (Jno. iii. 7)."

Whatever confusion there may be, and whatever over-estimation of the human will and power, and whatever excess of liberality in the interpretation of the charter of grace, we would rather err with these teachers in their unbounded reliance on God's unbounded treasures in Christ than with those who insist that God will never give grace enough to extinguish sin in the human heart, let prayer ask it ever so confidently.

There is no term which is more unanimously pitched upon for the branding of this theology than that of Mysticism. Almost every writer in every age, who has assailed the doctrine of the entire sanctification of the soul, and the possibility of leading a sinless life, has declared the notion to be mysticism or sentimental mysticism.

"Of the Roman Catholic Mystics, to whom allusion is here made, we learn more in a book which Mr. Pearsall Smith has published since the Oxford Conference. We point attention to this book, as it discloses beyond all doubt his own mysticism and belief in the inner light, which characterizes the body to which both Mr. and Mrs. Pearsall Smith once belonged, and to which they still appear to be united in sentiment. Before Mr. P. Smith published his Introduction to the *Principles of Hidden Life* a learned and reverend professor of theology called attention in our columns to the fact that Mr. P. Smith's own publication 'embodied the mysticism of Madame Guyon and the mediæval Mystics, as well as the semi-Pelagianism of Professor Upham.'"

Now it may be said generally that this term of contempt is one that has been freely applied to the very



holiest of the company of those who from the beginning have gone out to Christ without the camp, bearing His reproach. The men who have most deeply influenced Christian theology, who have defended it from formalism and dead dogmatism, and poured life into its sound formulas, have borne this name. The men who have most faithfully reproduced the life of Christ and His holy Apostles, have been known as mystics. The men who, especially in the middle ages, most self-denyingly and heroically laboured for the conversion of their fellow men—members of preaching brotherhoods such as Tauler—were or are now known as mystics. The Pietism of Germany and the Methodism of England in the last century were and still are classed among variations of Mysticism by scientific theological writers. Therefore it is not in our estimation a disparagement of the brethren who are gathered from many lands to talk and pray about sanctification that they are termed mystics.

But we are rather concerned to defend the general doctrine they teach—apart from any eccentricities of theirs—than the men themselves. The American company may be Mystics to an extent which it would be hopeless to defend. The central persons may have been Friends, and still cling to the "Inward light," as these tracts allege; they may treat too lightly the externalities of the Christian Church, and even keep the sacraments too much in the background. They may regard the outward and visible Church of Christ with very different eyes from ours. They may adopt an allegorising canon of interpretation of the Old Testament which is dangerous; and other minor aberrations of the mystical temper may be observable in them. We are strongly inclined to believe that this may be true. But the charge of rank Mysticism as hinted in the extract above given even cold-hearted friends might defend them from. Our Canons and Deans should read up on the subject of Mysticism before they hazard such imputations. Such mystics as we all ought to dread do not bring into prominence in every possible way the Atonement, the Promise, Faith. They never were wont to bring multitudes to united public prayer for a present blessing.

To be more definite. There are two species of the charge, as alleged rather against the doctrine of deliverance from sin generally than against these preachers of it in particular, which may be adverted to. One is that the

whole movement is one of "sentimental mysticism;" the other is that it "ignores experience and trusts to blind faith, which it idolises, and sets above the object of it." Both charges cannot be true at once. We cannot have a high-pitched excitement of sentimental feelings and a stoical contempt for all experience co-existing in one and the same theology. How far the Americans whose names are freely referred to—the Uphams, Finneys, Mahans, Boardmans, Palmers, Smiths—have been led away, or are in process of yielding to spiritualistic or sentimental or enthusiastic developments of modern falser Mysticism, it is not for us to say. Much use is made of a certain physico-spiritual communication to Professor Upham, testified by himself calmly after an interval of many years. We shall not at present refer any further to this, save to say that we should be very slow indeed to take up a reproach against such a man, with his writings lying before us, and remembering their influence, good on the whole, upon many minds. However inferior the living teachers may be, they strive to teach what Dr. Upham has taught for many long years, as follows :—

"It is a further characteristic of the mental state which we are considering, that a person in this state of mind has no disposition to exercise self-reflecting acts, originating either in undue self-love or in a want of faith. What I mean to say is, that, when he has done his duty, he no longer turns back upon himself and asks, as the half-way Christian often does, 'What does the world think of me?' Divested of all selfish purposes and aims, and having no will of his own, he acts deliberately and supremely for God; and, therefore, he feels that whatever is done, so far as motives and intentions are concerned, is well done. In that respect, no trouble enters his mind. There is no need of retrospection; no need of apologies to cavillers. Indeed, he can scarcely be said to exercise retrospective acts and reflections upon himself in any sense whatever. Such acts seem to be, to some extent, inconsistent with the fact that his heart is fixed exclusively upon an object *out of himself*. What is done stands written in the record of his Divine Master; and there he leaves it. His whole soul is given to the present moment. The present moment is given to God.

"Another and remarkable characteristic of this state of mind is this: He who is the subject of it is dead and crucified to all internal joys, also, as well as to all pleasures and joys of an external kind. He has no sympathy with those who are always crying, 'Make me happy, pay me well, and I will be holy.' Per-

sonal happiness, as a supreme or even a separate object of desire, never enters his thought. It makes no difference what the form of that happiness is, whether pleasures of the senses or pleasures of the mind. He is willing to abandon and sacrifice even the pure and sublime pleasure, almost the only consolation left to him in this sad world, which flows from communion with those who, like himself, are sanctified to God. His true happiness consists in hanging upon the cross, and in being crucified to self. Whether he is tempted, or not tempted, interiorly and in the bottom of his heart he can say, "All is well." Whether he suffers, or does not suffer, the throne of peace is erected in the centre of his soul. Wretchedness and joy are alike. He welcomes sorrow, even the deepest sorrow of the heart, with as warm a gush of gratitude as he welcomes happiness, IF THE WILL OF GOD IS ACCOMPLISHED. In that will his soul is lost, as in a bottomless ocean. 'Lord, I will not follow Thee,' says a devout person, 'by the way of consolations and self-pleasures, but only by LOVE. I desire Thee only, and nothing out of Thee, for myself. If I ever mention anything as appertaining to me, if I name myself, I mean Thee only: for Thou only art me and mine. My whole essence is in Thee. I desire nothing which comes from Thee, but *Thee Thyself*. I had rather suffer for ever the cruel torments of hell, than enjoy eternal happiness without Thee. If I knew I should be annihilated, yet would I serve Thee with the same zeal; for it is not for my sake, but Thine, that I serve Thee. Oh, how great is my joy, that Thou art sovereignly good and perfect!'"

If this is the kind of religion which these Revivalists are striving to urge upon the pursuit of Christian people, it seems hardly just to call it "sentimental." It does not by any means answer to any definition of the meaning of that term. It goes almost too far in prescribing independence of all feeling, and indifference to mere emotion, and the exclusion of the sensibilities and emotions of religious experience from the tests of a prosperous piety. As to the other charge, that they substitute faith for the object of faith, we must reserve our remarks. Suffice now to say, that it was never a characteristic of morbid mysticism to exalt faith at all. The soul's reliance on the promises of God, and perfect confidence that these promises must be accomplished, has always been a way too circuitous for that kind of mysticism, which has refused to be content with anything short of direct intuition of truth. We have no evidence that these teachers exalt the office of contemplation at the expense of that of meditation. They make the sayings of the Word of God, as understood by

themselves, the standard and criterion of sound experience, and the guarantee and warrant of true hope. Then they are not mystics,—save, as remarked above, in the same sense as all are mystics who look for secret, perceptible and undoubted experiences of an operation of the Holy Ghost which the world knoweth not.

There is one point on which the censors are exceedingly severe, that is, the habitual reference made by the new teachers to the direct influence of the Holy Spirit as an Expositor of His own truth. This certainly is very much like mysticism; but then it is the best mysticism. Dr. McNeile says:—

“A fruitful source of self-deception in real Christians is the notion that the Holy Spirit is a revealer as well as an interpreter of truth; that He speaks to us not only by the written Word, but also by visions, or feelings, or aspirations, or impressions, independent of the Word; and extending even to what is sometimes claimed as a physical consciousness, as in the case you cited of Dr. Upham.”

The case alluded to,—like very many others which it is easier to dismiss with a voluntary humility than to disprove, whether as facts or as possibilities—we shall not investigate. The point is, whether or not Christian people ought to be warned against expecting the teaching of the Spirit through “feelings, aspirations, and impressions.” Dr. McNeile adds “visions” and “independent of the Word.” What this latter qualification means it is hard to say. But we dare to maintain that many of the phenomena of the Pentecostal times have been continued, are common, and ought to be expected in every age. Of course they can never oppose the Word; nor can they be independent of it in the sense of introducing new revelations; but they do, unless innumerable witnesses deceive us, impart fresh and vivifying and realising apprehensions of old truth, and that oftentimes with such vividness as to convey almost the sense of a new revelation. We would be still more emphatic as to the other words. Undoubtedly, the Divine Spirit does stir up the minds of multitudes by kindling aspirations and desires. We believe that He is at this moment moving upon the hearts of Christian people in almost every part of Christendom to desire the powers and influences of a more abundant Christian life. The literature of both worlds, of all communions, has long attested this.

The movement, of which just now Brighton is the centre, is but one slight evidence of a great fact. And there is nothing in the tone and character of the testimonies we have been considering more unpleasant to ourselves than the want of sympathy they betray with this widespread yearning. It is true that there are not wanting decent protests by anticipation against such a charge as this. But the fact remains. The hearts of our critics do not swell with joy that holiness is thus longed for by thousands upon thousands, because that holiness is declared too boldly to be the privilege of the soul itself, and to be attainable too much in independence of works.

We now propose to consider the charges of unsoundness as directed against the more specific doctrines of the "Brighton Convention." Almost all that remains to be said has been more or less anticipated; but it will serve a good purpose to retrace our steps. It has been observed that we have here two topics: the nature of the great critical change; and the state into which it conducts the believer. Each of these may be subdivided into three heads. The crisis is the baptism of the Spirit, the faith in Christ as sanctifier, and entire consecration. The state is that of the higher life, entire sanctification from sin, and perfect union with God. It must be premised that for this analysis no one is responsible but ourselves. We make it for our own convenience, that we may be able to reduce to order the miscellaneous objections made by the enemies of this teaching, and by ourselves who are not its enemies.

As to the former, Dr. Mahan represents the baptism of the Spirit introducing to the higher life; the two other ideas, that of faith in the sanctifying Saviour and perfect consecration to God, are common to all the company.

The baptism of the Holy Ghost will be best explained by a few passages from two works of Dr. Mahan's, mentioned at the head of this article. The earlier contains in the preface these words:—

"There is another class of passages relating to 'the promise of the Spirit,'—a class which demands very special regard. We refer to such as the following: 'He that believeth on me, as the Scriptures hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this he spake of the Spirit, which they that believed on Him should receive (that, consequently, none had then received): for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified.' What fulness of blessedness do you enjoy,

reader, if to you the Holy Ghost has been given as here promised! If that blessedness is not yours, but one reason can be assigned for the melancholy fact: the Holy Ghost, as here promised, has not yet been given to you. Paul put this important question to certain believers, when he first met them, to wit: 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost *since* ye believed?' Does not this question imply that the promise of the Spirit awaits the believer *after* conversion? Does not the apostle refer to the same great truth, in the following statement to believers at Ephesus? 'In whom ye also trusted, *after* that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, *after* that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.' Have you fully apprehended, and duly pondered, the import of such a question, and of such statements as the above? Does not the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Ghost need, at the present time especially, when so much is thought and said upon the subject, a careful and prayerful examination, and a full elucidation?"

It does not promise much for the volume that the original Greek of all these quotations teaches precisely the opposite of what we are required to learn from them. "Did ye on believing receive the Holy Ghost?" "In whom ye also trusted, when ye heard the word of truth; in whom also, when ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit." "This He spake of the Spirit which they that believed on Him should, when they believed on Him, receive." Dr. Mahan honestly states that "two distinct and opposite forms of instruction upon this subject are being distinctly set forth before the Churches."

"According to one 'the promise of the Spirit' is always fulfilled at the moment of conversion. What is subsequently to be expected is merely a continuation and gradual increase of what was then conferred. According to the other view, 'the Spirit falls upon,' 'comes upon' believers, and 'the sealing and earnest of the Spirit' are given, not in conversion, but 'after we have believed.' The Spirit, first of all, induces in the sinner 'repentance towards God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.' 'After he has believed,' that is, after conversion, 'the Holy Ghost comes upon,' 'falls upon,' and 'is poured out' for his life mission and work. In this baptism of power, this 'sealing and earnest of the Spirit, which is always given, not on conversion, but 'after we have believed,' 'the promise of the Spirit is fulfilled.

"It seems undeniable that if this last is not, and the former is, the correct view, inspired men must have fundamentally erred upon this subject. With them it is undeniable that conversion was not



*prima facie* evidence that the convert had received 'the sealing and earnest of the Spirit.' Hence the question which they everywhere put to converts, to wit: 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?'"

We cannot quote any further. Nor is it necessary, as all that follows is simply an expansion of the one point, that "the gift of the Spirit was not expected *in*, but *after*, conversion." Suffice to say that the whole theory is contradicted by the uniform tenor of the New Testament. The reception, the conscious reception, of the Holy Ghost is everywhere declared to be the sign and note of a genuine faith and of a genuine Christianity. "They of the Circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost, for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." There is only one passage which even seems to look the other way. The other passages, as we have seen, are against it. The relicts of John's baptism were not believers in Jesus, as the fully revealed Saviour; they knew nothing about the Holy Ghost but what had come down to them in a wavering tradition; they knew not the Gospel as based upon the revelation of the Trinity; and their faith had not been the faith of Jesus. But it is said of the Samaritans, that "when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet He was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Undoubtedly, there is here the semblance of the doctrine of a sealing descent of the Holy Ghost, which should confirm and consummate the personal Christianity of those who had already believed, only believed, in Jesus. It may be well to consider the methods of explaining this which are usually adopted.

It is well known that the dogma and rite of confirmation has been built upon it, as being the strongest expression of what some other passages are supposed to teach less directly. But we do not find even the slightest reference to a continuation of the apostolic imposition of hands for the communication of the Holy Spirit. When it is remembered that, in the only cases mentioned, the presence of

the Holy Ghost was signalised by miraculous effects, it is only a legitimate assumption that the first outpouring of the Spirit, at the great crisis in the history of the Church, was marked and distinguished by the presence and authentication of the Apostles. When the Spirit came down upon the Lord's own company, He needed no human demonstration. When He came down upon Samaria, half-way to the Gentiles, the Apostles solemnly invoked Him, and the Pentecostal signs, though reduced, were witnessed. So when the relicts of the most honourable economy of the Baptist were received into the Christian Church. So also when the Gentiles were received through the preaching of Peter to Cornelius. It is better to take refuge in this hypothesis than to accept a division of the Christian privilege after the fashion of the abettors of Confirmation and Dr. Mahan. At the same time both these theories have their measure of truth. There is a sealing upon the conscious faith of the responsible soul of what was only given in infant baptism as a pledge. And most certainly Dr. Mahan is right as to the ordinary facts of experience, however wrong in the theological ground of his doctrine. The Scripture speaks only of one baptism of a Spirit, never since withdrawn. It speaks of no baptism to be expected by those who are regenerated; for them the injunction is from the very outset, "Be filled with the Spirit." But who can look abroad upon the estate of Christendom without perceiving that the great majority of Christian men and women need what may be called a "new conversion," a "second blessing," and a "fresh baptism." This has been, doubtless, the experience of many who have called the blessing they have received at Brighton by a still higher name.

The two other terms to which attention has been directed as defining the great crisis, are consecration and faith in the Sanctifier. These are related to each other as instruments in us that secure the baptism already referred to: the consecration has more direct reference to the acting of our own will, and the faith more direct reference to the promise of Christ as a sanctification from all sin. Now all that is taught about these, in themselves, is sound enough. No believer in the New Testament, no loyal servant of Christ, can say a word against the doctrine that a Christian should dedicate his entire being to God, and should exercise firm faith in the sufficiency of Christ as a Sanctifier from sin.

"As to entire 'self-consecration,'" says Mr. Ryle, "of which so much is said in the new theology, I decline to say anything about it. I never in my life heard of any thorough evangelical minister who did not hold the doctrine and press it upon others. When a man brings it forward as a novelty I cannot help thinking that he can never have truly known what true conversion was. That the common standard of holiness is deplorably low, and that there may be some so-called Evangelicals whose whole creed consists in justification by faith and opposition to Popery, I do not deny. But that the duty and privilege of entire self-consecration is systematically ignored by Evangelicals, and has only been discovered, or brought into fresh light by the new theologians, I do not for a moment believe."

Now here we must demur. It can hardly be said that the doctrine of entire self-consecration has not been brought into fresh light by the new teachers. What is here meant by the word "entire" has been impressed upon thousands of minds and hearts in a manner never felt before. It is not meant that they have taught a new doctrine: that would be equivalent to saying that they taught error. Nor is it meant to intimate that they teach a faultless doctrine. We think, for instance, that in the language of Scripture, the act of consecration is entirely that of the Holy Ghost; He is the sanctifier or consecrator; while the only function of the Christian is to dedicate or present himself. We also agree with the censor that it is universally preached, and that there is no Christianity which is not supposed to be that of an entire presentation or oblation of the body and soul to God in Christ, to the Redeeming Lord, and to the Spirit His administrator in the Church. We are willing enough also to admit that the entireness of the dedication is the entireness of the Christianity as a good beginning; in other words, that perfect self-dedication or self-consecration is the perfect entrance on the Christian life. So far as the tone of teaching conveys the idea that this self-consecration is the condition of entering upon a state of Christian perfection as distinguished from that of mere regeneration we should hold it chargeable with error. Entire self-dedication, persevered in through the conflict with self and the world, at length is consummate in the entire sanctification of the soul. It is as a principle of action perfect, but requires the discipline of practice to bring it to its consummate result. The habit and character must be consecrated. Granted all this, it still remains that the teaching of these evangelists of the more devoted life has been in-

strumental in awakening multitudes to the feeling that religion is matter of most awful requirement: that the very condition of becoming a disciple in the Saviour's school is the "denying self, the taking up the cross and the following of Him" in entire self-surrender and unlimited devotion.

Dr. Moody Stuart's Address to the Free Church General Assembly contains many pithy and forcible remarks, conceived with appropriate candour, dignity, and moderation. These Addresses are published under the title *Recent Awakenings and Higher Holiness*. They are deeply interesting for many reasons. They manifest much more interest in the religious movements of the day than some of those documents from which we have quoted, and it is with pleasure we quote the following:—

"But along with faith and prayer and self-surrender, there are daily lessons to be learned in detail by us all. Our Lord Jesus Christ would Himself live over again in the world in the person of each one of you, and in the place where He has planted each as His own representative in the earth. In the marriage of the Lamb the Bride will come to Him washed in His own blood and clothed in His own righteousness; and also 'in raiment of needle-work' wrought out through her own hands by God working in her to will and to do; in a clothing minutely beautiful as by the million-fold puncture of the needle—'stitch, stitch, stitch'—till her patient continuance in well-doing is crowned with glory, honour, and immortality. In this trying, humbling, yet most glorious process the soul is helped by all kinds of detail, such as are found in Thomas à Kempis: 'How little soever the thing may be, if it be inordinately loved and regarded it defiles the soul and keeps it back from the supreme good. No man is safe to speak but he that willingly holds his peace. What thou art thou art; nor is it any use to thee to be accounted greater than what thou art in the sight of God.' Or again, in the words of John Wesley: 'It is hardly credible how straight the way is, and of how great consequence before God the smallest things are. As a very little dust will disorder a clock, and the least grain of sand will obscure our sight, so the least grain of sin which is upon the heart will hinder its right motion towards God. And as the most dangerous wind may enter at little openings, so the devil never enters more dangerously than by little unobserved incidents, which seem to be nothing, yet insensibly open the heart to great temptations.'"

Dr. Mahan has been quoted before, as encouraging the idea of a new and higher dispensation of the Spirit, anointing the Christian for deeper sanctity and nobler service. At this point we may quote this eminent writer again, as one

who sees the danger to which the doctrine of his fellow labourers is exposed, and knows how to guard against it :—

"I hear much said, and much is written, about receiving Christ as our present sanctification—much which, as it appears to me, should be received with great caution and self-reflection. When we look to Christ to save us from actual sin, of course we should expect Him to do it now. But when we inquire of Him, as the Mediator of the New Covenant, to do for us all that is promised in that Covenant, the case is different. Heart-searching may precede the final cleansing, searching for God with all the heart must precede the finding of Him, and waiting and praying may precede, we cannot tell how long, the baptism of power. Here 'the vision may tarry;' and if it tarries, we must 'wait for it,' and watch and pray for its coming with 'full assurance of faith,' 'full assurance of hope,' and 'full assurance of understanding.' The disciples had to tarry for 'the promise of the Spirit,' and so may we."—*Out of Darkness*, p. 277.

The word Faith comes next. Mr. Pearsall Smith's chief work is entitled, *Holiness through Faith*. The faith that he teaches honours the Redeemer most perfectly: "Christ is our sanctification." As to this point, Mr. Ryle puts the pertinent question :—

"Perfectly true! I never heard of any well-taught Christian who did not hold that faith is the root of holiness, and that until we believe we are not sanctified at all. But I wish the advocates of the new theology would tell us plainly whether they hold that a man is sanctified by faith in the same way, and in the same sense, and in the same manner that he is justified by faith? If they say that he is, I ask them to explain why St. Paul often says that we are '*justified*' by faith without the deeds of the law,' but never once says that we are '*sanctified*' by faith without the deeds of the law! St. James goes further still, and tells us that '*faith without works is dead.*'"

Mr. Ryle overshoots the mark. St. Paul, or, if not St. Paul, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, declares that we are sanctified through faith. There is a sense in which sanctification is no other than justification under a temple aspect. What justification is in the court of law sanctification is in the house or temple of God. It is the entire deliverance of the soul from the stain and defilement of sin; the conscience is purged from dead works, and the spirit is accepted on the altar of consecration as if the eye of the Supreme saw in it no defect. Now, it is our persuasion that Mr. Pearsall Smith and his theologians really mean

this levitical sanctification, outward and inward, when they speak of holiness attained by faith. They are not speaking of the abolition of sin from the nature,—a glorious doctrine that they do not seem to understand,—but of the perfect acceptance of the obedient soul, obedient through faith working by love, on the part of God for Christ's sake, and in virtue of union with Him. But before we dwell a little further on this, we will fortify our general position by a valuable paragraph from a writer not yet quoted, Dr. Miller:—

"We have next to do with another and a more technical sense of the words 'perfect' and 'perfected.' The Holy Ghost, by the pen of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, declares, in words most precious to every justified believer in Jesus Christ, that He, our Victim, Priest, and Altar, has, 'by one offering,' 'perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' The sanctification here spoken of, while involving that which we commonly and rightly understand by sanctification, viz., the purifying work of the indwelling Spirit of God (for all the justified are thus sanctified), intends primarily ceremonial or legal sanctification, the consecration of the believer's person and whole nature by the all-cleansing blood of Christ. The believer, thus washed and consecrated, is 'perfected for ever.' In what sense? Now? We read in the opening of the tenth chapter, that the law, with its shadows—the sacrifices 'offered year by year continually'—could 'never make the comers thereunto perfect.' Could it have done so, 'the worshippers, once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins,' and there would have been no need for the repetition of the sacrifices. But these 'gifts and sacrifices' 'could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.' In other words, although the believing and pious Israelite knew that he was offering sacrifices of Divine appointment, which would be accepted by Jehovah, and which had a certain kind and measure of efficacy, he knew that he had not done with atonement. The sacrifices were not final. To-morrow the morning and the evening lamb must again be offered. Abib would return, and every succeeding Abib must have its Paschal lamb. The solemn ritual of the 'Day of Atonement' had been duly performed. But, next year, the one goat must be slain, and the scapegoat let go into the wilderness. There was then a standing conviction that expiatory sacrifices were again and again to be offered. The conscience was not thoroughly and finally purged—the believer was not ritualistically and sacrificially *perfected*."

We cannot say that there is an imputed sanctification, only because the word is preoccupied for the court of the Gospel,



where the terms are all judicial. But we may say that in the temple of the Gospel there is an external sanctification; and this is in a certain sense as perfect as justification is. We may therefore defend all who speak of "sanctification by faith, an immediate work." As to entire sanctification, that is to say, the removal by the energy of the Holy Ghost of all that hinders the spirit, already accepted in Christ, from being perfectly accepted in its own holiness, not Christ's, though derived from Him, we should be as slow as Mr. Ryle to speak of it as "entire sanctification by faith, an immediate work." Not indeed for his reason, as not believing in the possibility of the thing itself; nor as doubting that it is given at some great moment instantly and to faith; but because the formula would certainly tend to disparage another equally positive ordinance of the Gospel Covenant, that entire sanctification is the acquirement of a habit as well as the reception of a gift.

This leads to an observation which has been hinted again and again in these pages, that the doctrine of holiness here presented is no other than what may be called the normal and consummate estate of regeneration, as it invariably accompanies justification before God. There are two views of the change wrought on every believer; two views in Scripture, warranted and confirmed by facts. There is a righteousness infused in principle, and a righteousness perfected in act. There is a sanctification which is the presentation of the soul as accepted, and a sanctification, entire and finished, when the oblation is absolutely undefiled. So there is an infusion of the principle of life in regeneration, like the life in the grain of mustard seed, or the secret energy of leaven; and there is the full regeneration of the soul which born of God sinneth not. Now, a sound doctrine of regeneration must pay its tribute to both aspects. That which is held by many teachers, from America especially, does justice only to the latter, and almost ignores the former. They elevate regeneration to its highest Scriptural level, and forget that it is a new state in which there are many degrees. Almost all that we gather from the extracts before us as descriptive of the "second conversion," or the "second blessing," is simply the first in its perfect integrity.

But we now fairly enter the estate into which this critical change is supposed to introduce us; the higher or resurrection life, the perfect state, and union with God.

The first of these expressions, the Higher Life, has become

by degrees a kind of defining term, characterising this kind of theology. That is the phrase which springs to all lips when the subject is referred to. The books published by the teachers, especially by those in America, are advertised as "the Literature of the Higher Life." The use of the phrase has been much objected to, and that on many grounds. No good purpose would be served by examining these various grounds in order: the defence is obvious, that there is a higher level of Christian attainment and enjoyment to which all alike are invited in the charter of the Christian covenant. It may be said, that the polemics now lying before us assume that there are two classes on this subject: those who believe that there is only one order of life for the believer, the life of the new man, which is increasing in proportion as the life of the old man decreases; and those who believe that there is a state attainable in which the old man, or body of sin, is totally destroyed and dead, and the new life, therefore, consummate and full. The former are said to believe in a life which is ever becoming more abundant in progressive increase to the end of probation; the latter to believe that there is a crisis in the development of that life which is of so great importance as to warrant its being called a higher order of life. The opponents of these insist upon it that the Scripture never makes any such distinction: speaking only of one life of faith. In this they are too positive. Our Lord said, that He came "that they might have life, and have it more abundantly:" that is, might have it *MORE*. He has at least left it indeterminate whether the more is the more of steadfast continuity of increase, or the more of a higher impartation. A careful and a generous interpretation of Scripture—these should be united—will find reason to mediate between these two. There is a life which continually grows in all that constitutes life in its various elements; there is a perfection of that life which results from the removal of that which lets, and is a new and perfect rest; and this nobler state of redemption is not attained by a sudden leap, but through processes which are always the conditions of the energy of faith, processes that cannot be dispensed with, though they may be condensed into a brief space. Still, as the term is not used in Scripture; as it has not been current in the best phraseology of the people of God; and as it may easily be misinterpreted to the disadvantage of that lower life which is the staple of New-Testament description, it seems better to avoid it.

It is right to add that this name has not been much affected by the teachers in question. Other phrases, such as "resurrection life" and "overcoming life" have been more familiar to those who attended the Conference or have read the new literature. Much also has been said and written against the former of these terms; and, certainly, some applications of it are quite indefensible. To those who are not disposed to make a man an offender for a word, and who make allowance for the difficulty of varying the phraseology of public discourses, the error will seem a venial one. We have collocated the second term given above as being in our view the corrective of the former. Whatever may seem transcendent and unreal, and too high in the conception of "resurrection life," or what Scripture calls the life of the regenerate quickened with Christ, is reduced and toned down by the admission that it is after all only a life that overcomes and keeps the victory by faith.

If the censors of this teaching urge that the resurrection life of the believer is not described in the New Testament as a life of perfect death to the motions and impulses of sin, it must be admitted that they are right. They are justified in saying also that "the words 'ye died with Christ—ye are alive unto God in Him,' are not restricted to any special section or class of believers: they are avowedly used of *all* believers as *such*. The power of Scripture exhortation, as addressed to believers, is founded on the fact that the grace of God has already brought them *in Christ* into that condition to which they are exhorted to be practically confirmed." Undoubtedly, we are bidden to "reckon ourselves dead" unto sin, as having borne our penalty, and "alive unto God," as having been released in our Surety. But when this is stated to exhaust the meaning, the error is as great as it is obvious. The stress is not always on "IN Christ." St. Paul, on the contrary, says that the resurrection life that he lived by the faith of Christ was Christ living "in *me*," a life which to all believers in Christ is the power of His omnipotent spirit within them. The resurrection life is not simply that of judicial imputation: such a notion dims the glory of the entire New Testament. When the eyes of these opponents are enlightened they must needs know "what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places." In the face of

this passage, which links our Lord's resurrection and the life of believers in the mystical and internal as well as in the judicial sense, no argument against the perfect "resurrection life" of the believer will have any validity. The very highest doctrine of sanctification is carried by such words as those and others in the next chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Indeed, the glorious issue of Christ living in us, the boundless possibilities of His risen life in our souls, may well sustain every word Mr. Pearsall Smith and multitudes before him have said as to the victory of the resurrection life. But the Methodist doctrine—for such in a certain sense it may still be called—has carefully avoided falling into the mistake into which these teachers have fallen, of appropriating this term to the life of entire sanctification.

The other phrase, "overcoming life," though not one known to either Scripture or theology, aptly expresses the fact that the life of regeneration is one of constant victory over sin. It may be the life of the entirely sanctified, in whom "concupiscence" has lost its evil, and reverted back to its other meaning of mere desire incident to the flesh, without any complicity or affinity with sin; in whose case the victory is perfectly gained through the overwhelming might of the Spirit in the inner man, so that they have only to keep themselves from the external enemy who seeks to "touch" them, and to preserve or maintain the victory over self which God has given them. This seems to be the state for which Mr. P. Smith reserves the term resurrection or overcoming life. But he does not seem to remember, what his opponents well remember, that this ideal of the resurrection life is but little alluded to in the New Testament. The actual, realised, common resurrection life is something much below this. Hence it is impossible to defend such passages as these, quoted by Mr. Hemington:—

" 'The body of sin' must yet 'be destroyed' and 'burned' ere he can enjoy resurrection-life. The apostle says, 'you hath he quickened' of all who have died and risen with Christ in regeneration. You need not, as do some, be all your life dying, and yet never dead; always on the cross, yet never crucified to the world. Oh, what a lifetime of suffering some insist upon enduring in spiritual hospitals, when, if they would but be 'planted in the likeness of Christ's death,' they would find 'also the likeness of His resurrection.' "

We deplore the use of language which seems to declare needless the conflict of the regenerate life in death and death in life. We deplore it all the more because we most heartily believe, with Mr. P. Smith, that the full and complete Christian life is just what he describes it. "If we come to a full death of the old Adam, there will be a full resurrection of the new. Every particle of the old life retained, by just so much prevents the completeness of the new." We do not share his opponent's indignation at such words as these: "The natural will being dead, the agony of a divided life and purpose is gone; for now our glorious motive power, God's own will, works in us, freed from internal opposition." Nor do we demur to the words "that we should be released from the inward proneness to sin." Nor do we feel much theological difficulty, certainly no practical difficulty, in assenting to these: "That, like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life, without the taint upon us of the corruptions now buried in the grave." Nor can we deny that there is something in the tone of what follows that carries our heart with it: "The soul, surrounded by temptation and defilement feels itself somewhat as a dead miser would be in the presence of a bag of gold; not, indeed, without a liability to sin, yet with an actual deadness of soul towards it. In such a condition how sin can be a temptation I leave." But, after all, much injury is done, cannot fail to be done, by the very appearance, even supposing it be only the appearance, of denying the virtue of resurrection life, and the normal character of Christianity, according to God's will and ordinance, to the Christian who is watching and assisting the contest between the two natures in himself.

We instinctively think of that solitary paragraph to which Mr. Pearsall Smith so often refers: that, namely, in which St. Paul for once speaks of Christians as having crucified their flesh with its affections and lusts. We do not deal uncharitably with the American teachers, nor do we desire to breathe the slightest chill on a work the enthusiasm of which is of God; but we cannot help thinking that the full force of St. Paul's description of the regenerate life is missed. A thorough study of the two chapters, the seventh of Romans and the fifth of Galatians, in their harmony and in their differences, would be of great service to these agents of the Spirit, and make their teaching much more effectual. As

the chapter in the Romans refers to the life of preliminary grace on the way to Christ, in which *the mind and the flesh* are in discord, the flesh enslaved to sin, the mind delighting with the law of God revealed by the Holy Ghost to it, and evoking its primitive sympathy with the law; so the chapter in the Galatians refers to the conflict between *the Spirit and the flesh*, a conflict which is actually spoken of as the normal state of the Christian, though not as necessarily continuing until death. In the former chapter there is nothing higher in the soul than the mind; in the latter chapter it is not the mind but the Spirit. But the regenerate life is by St. Paul made consistent with a struggle in which the spirit resists the flesh and the flesh the spirit, "so that ye may not do the things that ye would." In three ways the apostle describes this conflict. First, it is between the Holy Spirit in man's spirit and the flesh: this is the guarantee of perfect victory. Secondly, it is the living and walking in the Spirit, and not after the lusts of the flesh. Thirdly, it is the crucifixion unto death—crucifixion is not death—of the flesh. That the crucified flesh is to die, and to die in the present life, the apostle teaches not here but elsewhere: for instance, when writing to the Colossians, he uses a much stronger word and bids them "mortify their members on the earth." Most undoubtedly St. Paul exhorts us all to co-operate with the Holy Spirit, who kills and makes alive, in putting to death absolutely the several elements of evil in our being. There is somewhere a midway course between the two extremes; and we repeat that a careful study of the two chapters above-mentioned, in their differences, would save us from all error. We may defend the doctrine of entire sanctification against the Calvinistic opponents of it by a sounder interpretation of Romans vii. than that of Mr. Smith; and we may correct most of Mr. Smith's own errors by such a tribute to Gal. v. as does honour to its description of the ordinary Christian life. The distinction between the two chapters is of great importance; and in the light of it we know how to appreciate the following passage delivered against the "Higher Christian life" by the Rev. Mr. Garratt:—

"This conflict has been felt by saints of God in every age. We cannot read our Bibles without seeing it in all the most eminent examples of godliness in both Testaments; and the history of the Church, all along its course, is full of the same fact. It is not



that views similar to those now taught on this subject have not been held before. Luther mentions not only Schoolmen, but some of the early fathers as maintaining similar views as to the seventh chapter of Romans. The possibility of Christians living without sinning was held by some early in the Church, and its consequence then was that those who held it plunged into temptation as though it were powerless to harm them, and fell grievously. It has been revived again and again. But the men who have been God's great instruments in this world of ours,—the men whom others have felt and known to be emphatically holy,—have always been deeply conscious of this inward conflict. Even John Wesley, who held in theory some doctrine somewhat like it, did not, as far as I know, look upon himself as an example of it; and all the men, whose names are too many to recount, who have told us much about themselves, and been greatly honoured by God,—such as Luther, Bradford the martyr, and others,—have echoed Paul's words in the seventh of Romans and the fifth of Galatians, as their own experience. The reverse is no novel error, no new discovery, whether of error or of truth; but it has been tried in every age, and found wanting. The Christian life has always proved to be the Christian conflict. In spite of every effort to think it or make it otherwise, the heart has remained a battlefield. The path to glory has been the path of fighting, struggling, wrestling with the world, the flesh, and the devil; and the words have ever proved true, 'The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.'

Mr. Wesley has been referred to in this passage. He certainly "held in theory some doctrine;" but the rest of the quotation is hardly applicable. He held no doctrine like either Mr. Garratt's or Mr. Smith's as to the relation of entire sanctification to the regenerate life. There never was a teacher of men who more earnestly taught the necessity of the entire sanctification of the soul from the indwelling of sin—of sin as God views it and man describes it—before death; but there was never a teacher who more carefully guarded the doctrine of sin in believers. This is not the place for an examination of Mr. Wesley's doctrine, but the following sentences from his *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* may have their use:—

"Our second Conference began August 1, 1745. The next morning we spoke of sanctification as follows:—

"Q. When does inward sanctification begin?

"A. In the moment a man is justified. (Yet sin remains in him, yea, the seed of all sin, till he is sanctified throughout).

From that time a believer gradually dies to sin, and grows in grace.

"Q. Is this ordinarily given till a little before death ?

"A. It is not, to those who expect it no sooner.

"Q. But may we expect it sooner ?

"A. Why not ? For, although we grant (1) that the generality of believers whom we have hitherto known were not so sanctified till near death ; (2) that few of those to whom St. Paul wrote his epistles were so at that time ; nor (3) he himself at the time of writing his former epistles ; yet all this does not prove that we may not be so to-day.

"Q. In what manner should we preach sanctification ?

"A. Scarce at all to those who are not pressing forward ; to those who are, always by way of promise : always drawing, rather than driving.

"Our fourth Conference began on Tuesday, June the 16th, 1747. As several persons were present who did not believe the doctrine of perfection, we agreed to examine it from the foundation.

"In order to this, it was asked—

"How much is allowed by our brethren who differ from us with regard to entire sanctification ?

"A. They grant (1.) That every one must be entirely sanctified in the article of death. (2.) That till then a believer daily grows in grace, comes nearer and nearer to perfection. (3.) That we ought to be continually pressing after it, and to exhort all others so to do.

"Q. What do we allow them ?

"A. We grant (1.) That many of those who have died in the faith, yea, the greater part of those we have known, were not perfected in love till a little before their death. (2.) That the term *sanctified* is continually applied by St. Paul to all that were justified. (3.) That by this term alone he rarely, if ever, means 'saved from all sin.' (4.) That consequently it is not proper to use it in that sense, without adding the word *wholly, entirely*, or the like. (5.) That the inspired writers almost continually speak of or to those who were justified, but very rarely of or to those who were wholly sanctified. (6.) That, consequently, it behoves us to speak almost continually of the state of justification ; but more rarely, at least in full and explicit terms, concerning entire sanctification."

The second of the terms which describe the state of grace, of which our teachers are the heralds, is that of Perfection. No word excites so much animosity as this. The very mention of it in any form seems to some ears to betoken heresy, and heresy of the worst type, at once. The

zealous theologian from whom we have quoted once or twice, plunges in *medias res*. The first sentence of his pamphlet thus delivers its thesis :—

“The Perfectionism, or the doctrine of the ‘Higher Christian Life,’ as taught by Mr. Pearsall Smith, is, with slight differences, identical with Wesley’s favourite dogma of ‘Sinless Perfection in the Flesh.’ Just as two drugs differing only in their constituent properties, but being both alike deadly, would each be labelled ‘Poison,’ so the Perfectionism of Pearsall Smith and the Sinless Perfection of Wesley are alike unscriptural,—alike dangerous and mischievous in their tendency and influence, and need, the one as much as the other, to be repudiated and rejected by all who would be kept in an evil day from the defilement of error.”

It is undoubtedly true that John Wesley had a special love for the doctrine of the destruction of sin in the members of Christ’s mystical body on earth; in this being like every true Christian. It is not to be denied, further, that he had a special anxiety to preach the doctrine of deliverance from sin as the privilege of every believer. Lastly, it is undeniable that he regarded himself and his people as raised up to bear testimony to this doctrine. He himself never permitted it to be absent from his thoughts. The study of it stretched over the whole of his active life. His letters bear witness that it was in his estimation the foremost Methodist testimony. He saw the doctrine in all lights. Among his people he witnessed every possible aspect of it, and mistake about it; he became acquainted with every perversion to which it was liable. Through good and through evil report he clung to this doctrine: that what God is pleased to reckon as a fulfilment of the law in perfect love was possible to the faith of the Christian. But it is a mark of ignorance to write “Wesley’s favourite dogma of ‘sinless perfection in the flesh.’” How far he went in the use of the word “perfect” will appear from the following letter :—

“The true Gospel touches the very edge both of Calvinism and Antinomianism; so that nothing but the mighty power of God can prevent our sliding either into the one or the other.

“The nicest point of all which relates to Christian perfection is that which you inquire of. This much is certain: They that love God with all their heart, and all men as themselves, are Scripturally perfect. And surely such there are; otherwise the promise of God would be a mere mockery of human weakness. Hold fast this. But then remember, on the other hand, you have

this treasure in an earthen vessel ; you dwell in a poor, shattered house of clay, which presses down the immortal spirit. Hence all your thoughts, words, and actions are so imperfect ; so far from coming up to the standard (that law of love which, but for the corruptible body, your soul would answer in all instances), that you may well say, till you go to Him you love,—

“ ‘ Every moment, Lord, I need  
The merit of Thy death.’ ”

But Mr. Wesley never used the term “sinless perfection.” “Christian perfection,” was indeed a favourite expression with him, as it has been with many others before him and since. But for reasons which do honour both to his theology and to his good sense, he abstained from the dogma charged upon him.

“ ‘ There is such a thing as perfection ; for it is again and again mentioned in Scripture.’ ‘ Is it sinless ? It is not worth while to contend for a term. It is “salvation from sin.” ’ ‘ I do not contend for the term “sinless,” though I do not object to it.’ ‘ I believe this perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith ; consequently, in an instant. But I believe a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant.’ ‘ To explain myself a little further on this head : (1) Not only sin, properly so called (that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law), but sin, improperly so called (that is, an involuntary transgression of a Divine law, known or unknown), needs the atoning blood. (2) I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes those involuntary transgressions which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. (3) Therefore *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. (4) I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. (5) Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please : I do not, for the reasons above-mentioned.

“ ‘ Q. What advice would you give to those that do, and those that do not, call them so ?

“ ‘ A. Let those that do not call them sins, never think that themselves or any other persons are in such a state as that they can stand before Infinite justice without a Mediator. This must argue either the deepest ignorance, or the highest arrogance and presumption. Let those who do call them so, beware how they confound these defects with sins properly so called.

“ ‘ But how will they avoid it ? How will these be distinguished from those, if they are all promiscuously called sins ? I am much afraid, if we should allow any sins to be consistent with perfection, few would confine the idea to those defects concerning which only the assertion could be true.’ ”

Those who read and compare the various passages in which Mr. Wesley discusses this doctrine, will not fail to perceive how loth he was to give up the thought of a "sinless perfection": a sinless perfection "in the flesh" would have been noted by him as something not comprehensible. He evidently longed to be able, with full consent of his judgment, to write the words, but could not. He saw that the glory of Christianity is that it can make the comers unto God perfect, as delivered both from the conscience and the consciousness of sin. But he also knew—no man ever knew and felt more keenly—the immense interval there is, and must be, between the highest attainments of the saint upon earth, encompassed with infirmity, and the absolute requirement of the Divine law. Therefore he would never speak of sinless perfection, though fully assured that the evangelical definition of sin would not include such defects and necessary shortcomings. He knew also that the one personality of the Christian reckons to self the long cancelled and obliterated offences; just as the Apostle, at the gate of heaven, calls himself the chief of sinners.

Perhaps one of the finest descriptions in the language of an entirely sanctified state, is that which we shall now quote from the preface to one of the early collections of hymns. On the revision of this preface many years afterwards some notes or retractations were appended: such as, "this is far too strong;" and so forth. We shall not indicate the corrections. For ourselves, we prefer the original without them; they exhibit the sublime ideal to which every theory of the perfect Christian life ought to conform:—

"The Son hath made them free, who are then born of God, from that great root of sin and bitterness, pride. They feel that all their sufficiency is of God; that it is He alone who is in all their thoughts, and 'worketh in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure.' They feel that it is not they who speak, but the Spirit of their Father which speaketh in them; and that whatsoever is done by their hands, 'the Father which is in them, He doeth the works.' So that God is to them All in all, and they are as nothing in His sight. They are freed from self-will; as desiring nothing, no, not for one moment (for perfect love casteth out all desire), but the holy and perfect will of God: not supplies in want; not ease in pain; not life, or death, or any creature; but continually crying in their inmost soul, 'Father, Thy will be done.' They are freed from evil thoughts, so that they cannot enter into them; no, not for one instant. Aforetime, when an

evil thought came in, they looked up and it vanished away. But now it does not come in ; there being no room for this in a soul which is full of God. They are freed from wanderings in prayer. Whensoever they pour out their hearts in a more immediate manner before God, they have no thought of anything past, or, absent, or to come ; but of God alone ; to whom their whole souls flow in one even stream, and in whom they are swallowed up. In times past, they had wandering thoughts darted in ; which yet fled away like smoke. But now that smoke does not rise at all, but they continually see Him which is invisible. They are freed from all darkness, having no fear, no doubt, either as to their state in general, or as to any particular action. For, their eye being single, their whole body is full of light. Whatsoever is needful, they are taught of God. They have an unction from the Holy One which abideth in them, and teacheth them every hour what they shall do and what they shall speak. Nor have they therefore any need to reason concerning it, for they see the way straight before them. The Lamb is their light, and they simply follow Him whithersoever He goeth. Hence, also, they are, in one sense, freed from temptation ; for though numberless temptations fly about them, yet they wound them not, they trouble them not, they have no place in them. At all times their soul is even and calm ; their heart is steadfast and unmovable ; their peace, flowing as a river, 'passeth all understanding ;' and they 'rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' For they are 'sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption,' having the witness in themselves, that 'there is laid up for them a crown of righteousness, which the Lord shall give them in that day ;' and being fully persuaded, through the Holy Ghost, that 'neither death nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate them from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus their Lord.'"

It is a melancholy descent to Mr. C. Hemington, who represents the severer and, we may add, more unrelenting enemies of the doctrine of sinlessness in the Christian.

"What Mr. Smith teaches, and to which we must refer, about the very root of sin being destroyed, is yet more detestable. He says, 'Many, taking the doctrine from their own feelings, have answered that the last root of sin has been destroyed, as well as the branches.' But whether, says Mr. Smith, 'the root of sin be subdued into inaction, or utterly extirpated, it is not in the range of consciousness to determine ;' by which remark he means, of course, that whilst some are sure that the very root of sin is destroyed in them, he himself is not quite so positive whether it be so or not. If, then, it be not in 'the range of his consciousness' to deter



mine whether or not, in his own case, the root of sin be destroyed, by what range, we would ask Mr. Smith, does he determine on page 91 of the same book, that 'the evil root is ready to spring up into bitter branches,' that 'the flesh is in us,' though he says he walks not in it; and that 'the destroyed body of sin is ready to revive at any moment.' If this be Mr. Smith's experience, then it is, and must be, in the range of his consciousness to determine that the root of sin is *not* destroyed in himself; and it can only be a mere 'trick of intellect' to say 'it is not in the range of consciousness to determine' whether the root of sin be destroyed in others. The plain truth is that Mr. Smith's unscriptural and soul-deceiving doctrine puts all who receive it upon the expectation of having all inward sin rooted out of them, and the very *root* of sin destroyed in them."

The question rises at once: What is there in the universe to hinder this? That there is so much hesitation, uncertainty, and inconsistency in the statements quoted on this subject is matter of regret; and shows that the teaching of the Brighton Convention needs more light. That light we fully believe will rise upon it. Let us finally hear Dr. Mahan, who is somewhat in the position of a Methodist mediator:—

"I hear instructions given to believers seeking this 'rest of faith,' instructions which I cannot approve. They are told that Christ will not take away their evil propensities, and prevent their acting within the mind, but will enable believers to resist and hold in subjection such promptings. The Apostle, on the other hand, tells us that, for the purpose that henceforth we should not serve sin, 'the old man is crucified with Christ,' and the body of sin is destroyed.' In express view of this fact, he requires us to 'reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin,' but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' As long as our lusts are left to 'war in our members,' there may be expected to be 'wars and fightings' in the churches, and lapses and backslidings in all their membership. Christ 'takes away our sins' by taking away the evil dispositions within us that prompt us to sin, and in the place of these dispositions giving us 'a Divine nature.'"—*Out of Darkness*, p. 154.

This passage is full of allusions to Scripture which might be exegetically excepted against; but it contains the whole truth, which a collation of these with other passages might be shown to establish.

We must, however, here bring these remarks to a close. The last point, the state of union with God and rest in Him

through the entire merging of the will in His will, we shall not enter upon. It is not contended against by the "Testimony of evangelical leaders;" and does not fall directly within the range of the present paper. It may be that the course of events will render it expedient to return to this question, and take a more positive view of it.

---

ART. V.—1. *Returns of Accommodation Provided in Wesleyan Methodist Chapels and other Preaching Places.* Obtained by the Wesleyan Chapel Committee, in pursuance of a Minute of the Conference of 1873, London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1875.

2. *The Twentieth Annual Report of the Wesleyan Chapel Committee.* 1874.

3. *The Sixth Report of the Metropolitan Wesleyan Chapel Building Fund.* 1874.

THE reasons why these *Returns of Accommodation Provided in Wesleyan Methodist Chapels* were sought and secured are given in the preface to the tables which present them to our view: "One of the special circumstances which led to the suggestion on which this action of the Conference was taken, was the publication, a short time before, of statistical returns in the *Nonconformist* newspaper, purporting to give the increased accommodation for religious worship provided by the respective denominations in certain large towns and cities. It was felt by many, and especially by those best qualified to form an opinion, that these returns did not adequately represent the vigorous efforts and surprising liberality of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion, in recent years, in relation to chapel-building." This reason commends itself to us as natural and right. For whatever may be said about the propriety or the policy of numbering the people, or the places of worship, when once the example of doing this is set, scrutiny and comparison are challenged, and any community which thinks "that, if the actual facts could be ascertained, they would present more favourable results than those thus published," i.e., concerning its own work and progress, must be held to be at liberty to correct the balance in its own interests if it can. And the second reason given greatly strengthens this argument: "In addition, the *Nonconformist* returns were restricted to populous cities and large towns. This restriction necessarily led to those returns giving only a partial view of the facts of the case." Now, considering how difficult, if not

impossible, the task of soliciting returns from all the other towns and villages of the country would have been, it is not surprising that the *Nonconformist* limited its labours to the thirty-six parishes of the metropolis and the 125 largest provincial towns. Still this gives "only a partial view of the facts of the case." For, according to the census of 1871, the population of England and Wales was 22,712,266; but the population of these 125 towns was only 6,545,999, and that of London in 1865, when the *Nonconformist* returns for it were made, was 3,015,494. So that, in round numbers, without being exact in figures, these returns represent only nine and a half millions out of a population of twenty-two millions, leaving thirteen millions of people—by far the larger part of the population—unrepresented. With these thirteen millions of people living in towns not incorporated, or with less than 10,000 inhabitants, the compiler says "there is no intention of dealing; nor is it necessary, for there is no reason to expect an outcome essentially different from that indicated by the subjoined tables." This non-intention is natural enough when we consider the double purpose which the *Nonconformist* returns may be presumed to have had in view,—the purpose, namely, of placing the Church of England in not flattering comparison with the Nonconformist Churches, and of making the Congregationalist Church as prominent as possible. And, by no means complaining of the purpose aimed at, we agree that it was not necessary to carry the investigations further, simply because it would not have served that purpose. But for that very reason another Church, being thus challenged, may deem it necessary to show what she at least has been doing for the thirteen millions of unwall'd population in the land with whom the writer does not concern himself. We think this reason is stated with remarkable clearness and force in the preface (p. iv.) to these Wesleyan Methodist returns:—"Whilst the activity and growth of influential sections of the nonconforming denominations had been, to a great extent, limited to the most populous centres, where resources could alone be found adequate to sustain an independent cause, the Methodist people had been quietly but perseveringly continuing their aggressive efforts among village populations, erecting better chapels, and making ampler provision for the spiritual necessities of rural districts. In order, therefore, to form a fair and just judgment of Connexional progress, it was imperative that information

should be obtained respecting the provision made in regard to both town and country." A writer in the *British Quarterly*, (April, 1874) says: "In this aggregate population of 6,545,999 it is almost superfluous to say is comprised (apart from the metropolis) the *élite* of the intelligence, enterprise, progressive thought, and active liberalism of the nation. It is in these great centres of industrial England we should naturally expect to find the most striking evidences of spiritual as well as of intellectual life." Now we accept the truth that the "most striking evidences" of life are to be found in these towns, but what does this imply? Does it imply that this life receives its inspiration, nourishment, discipline and training there? Then we demur. It is a fact presented by the Census Reports, that "more than one-half of the adult inhabitants of the metropolis were born out of London." And, proportionately and approximately, this is true of the large provincial towns. Life, all life in these great centres, is continually replenished and invigorated by fresh life from the country. Go on the flags of the Exchange, or into the vestries of the churches, and you will find that at least a fair proportion of the men of place and power there are men who came from the smaller towns and villages, whose young life grew vigorous and whose character was moulded by the healthier, quieter, and more solidifying influences which prevail there. The truth is, the cities are the theatres of life, on the stage of which men play their part; the villages are frequently the schools where they are trained to act it. And any implied comparison, however subtle, to the disadvantage of our rural population is akin to the vice of that social vanity in the city which would hide from view the homely seclusion whence, and the quiet, respectable parents from whom the subjects of it sprang.

But apart from these comparisons of quality and importance, we think that, being furnished with statistics of accommodation provided by all the churches in large towns, the Wesleyan Chapel Committee have conferred a general advantage by showing what they have done elsewhere also. For there is an "outcome essentially different from that indicated" by the returns drawn from the metropolis and these 125 large towns to be expected from the labours of those who toil among the more thinly scattered thirteen millions of the small towns and villages; or, if not "essentially different," yet instructive as to the situation

and work of the leading Churches among the people of England and Wales. Avowing our thorough sympathy with the *Nonconformist* compiler in his disclaimer against a census of religious profession we, nevertheless, cannot agree with him that to ascertain the "relative proportion of the principal denominations" in the large towns "is the best practical gauge of the religious resources of the country," especially when we know that for every hundred persons living in the large towns, about one hundred and forty are living in country places; and when we consider also that to supply a scattered population, comparatively poor, with accommodation for public worship and with the ministry of religion is a far more difficult task than to supply a compact town population with these. The resources of an army are tested in proportion to the extent of its line and the length of its march from its base of operations. And the resources of a church are tested in like manner. "The best practical gauge of the religious resources of the country" is to take the census of the whole country, and not of some selected favourite parts of it, and to see how those resources are developed in the cultivation of its whole area. And here, perhaps, it may be as well to give at once the Wesleyan Methodist Returns, so far as they are supplementary to those of the *Nonconformist*. According to these latter returns the Wesleyans had provided in London, in 1865, 52,454 sittings, and in the 125 large towns, in 1873, 376,738 sittings, making together 429,192. The total number of Wesleyan sittings in the whole of Great Britain, as now reported, is 1,723,495, so that Wesleyan Methodism provides, outside the limits of the towns compassed by the *Nonconformist* returns, no less than 1,294,303 sittings. It is true that of these about 39,000 are in London, being the increase since 1865, but the figures represent the number of sittings supplementary to those furnished by those returns. The percentage of increase on the returns of 1851 was said to be in London, 19; in the 112 large towns which could be compared it was 34·4 per cent. Now the average of increase for the whole of Great Britain, according to the Wesleyan Methodist Returns, is 48·59 per cent., which shows that the increase of Wesleyan accommodation, in the returns of 1851, in the unwallied towns and villages, was 92·37 per cent.; or, placing London in 1873 on a level with the 112 large towns, then the increase in the other parts of the



land was 62.78 per cent. Surely Wesleyan Methodism renders but simple justice to itself by presenting these returns, viewed even as supplementary, and thus showing the number of its sittings in proportion to the whole population and its percentage of increase in the country since the census of 1851. "It must, however, be borne in mind that when the religious worship census of 1851 was taken, many places of worship were included under the designation 'Wesleyan Methodist,' which did not actually belong to the Connexion at that time," and the percentage of increase is lowered in proportion as the returns for that year were unduly high. What that proportion was cannot be definitely ascertained; but, in his Report, Mr. Horace Mann says, "there were at that time" (when the census was taken) "339 chapels in connection with the (Reform) movement; having accommodation (after estimates for 51 defective schedules) for 67,814 persons."

Another reason, not defensive but instructive, for the issuing of these returns, is given: "A scheme, too, had been originated at a preceding Conference with a view to stimulate effort and encourage aggression in respect of chapel-building upon a more extensive scale than had hitherto prevailed; and a committee had been appointed to consider this proposal for the extension of Methodism in Great Britain, and to report to the ensuing Conference (1873). Correct information as to the progress already made, and the present accommodation provided in Wesleyan chapels and preaching places, appeared almost a necessity, if the preliminary deliberations of this committee were to have a practical issue." The report of that committee was presented to the last Conference, in 1874, from which we can quote only the following: "This committee is deeply convinced that a speedy and general effort should be made to raise a fund which shall supplement the ordinary funds of the Connexion, and the local resources of the people, in part to sustain an additional number of Home-Missionary ministers, whose duty it shall be to preach the Gospel in districts where Methodism does not now exist, and to facilitate the erection of chapels where needed, and the enlargement of others which are at present insufficient." The report was adopted by the Conference, and an influential committee appointed to promote the scheme. The information secured by these returns will, doubtless, be of great service to this committee, for they

will show where the labours of Methodism are most lacking, where the rate of recent progress has been lowest, and where a timely stimulus may be given with most effect. Evidently this is the practical purpose of these returns : not to suggest invidious comparisons, not to exalt Methodism among the churches, not to make her boastful because of the progress already made ; but to show how weak and behindhand she is in relation to the work which lies before her in common with the other Churches of the land.

The committee believe that these returns " may be relied upon as generally accurate." We think so too, making the fullest allowance for instances such as that which they themselves give. And these returns ought to be " generally accurate." The Wesleyan Methodists have facilities for a work of this kind which few others possess. The country is, for them, divided into distinct ecclesiastical provinces, districts and circuits. Every circuit has its distinct boundary, and every place within it is known and registered ; and every district has its given number of circuits which also are well known and tabulated, so that there is no intersection, and there can be no confusion of thought as to whence these returns come and of what they are. The basis on which they rest is well-defined and safe, which is a great advantage both positive and comparative. This is in marked contrast with the basis of the *Nonconformist* returns, which is irregular : sometimes it is the parish which forms the basis, sometimes the borough municipal, then the borough parliamentary, and, in one instance, Lincoln, it is the Union that is taken. Thus the results are fragmentary every way. Doubtless it is an immense advantage to have the full area of the country as the basis, and to have that area distinctly mapped out. Then also, their compact ministerial organisation would be of essential value to them in this service : every circuit has its staff of ministers, and these go in turn to all the places in the circuit, so that it is not too much to assume that this work has been done under the personal oversight of the ministers themselves, and in many instances done by them actually. Such a staff of enumerators could not be secured by any other agency. Who its enumerators were we know not, but some of them did not count very correctly. While subscribing to the " substantial accuracy " of its returns there are yet some items in them which, as the compiler himself says, are " very remarkable and a little perplexing."

Our eye fell on this one: Scarborough is said to have 24 churches (of England), 24 Wesleyan Methodist chapels, and 15 Primitive Methodist chapels! Such a mistake as this would be unpardonable in these returns of Wesleyan Chapel accommodation. If we add to what has been said that specific instructions were sent out from Manchester that the number of sittings was to be obtained by measurement, and not to be a mere estimate, we have said enough to show that, with every facility for success, the promoters of this work did everything they could to secure correct returns, and that in the main we may rely upon them as such.

These returns are presented to us in three tables: "1. Wesleyan Methodist chapels and preaching places in Great Britain on the 1st of December, 1873. 2. Summary table, giving returns for 1851 and 1873, with increase, number of chapels in course of erection, places given up since 1851, percentage of increase, &c., &c. 3. Number of preaching places and sittings distributed into counties, with population of each county at the census of 1871."

For this last table we feel ourselves deeply indebted to the General Chapel Secretaries, who must have found it to be a great tax upon their powers of investigation and patience. Small as the table is its items could not have been extracted from and collated with the Circuit and District Returns without much painstaking and thought; for these ecclesiastical divisions of Methodism have scarcely any respect at all to the county divisions of the land. This labour, however, will have its reward. The table will be highly appreciated by all intelligent Wesleyans, and it will be very useful to some who may not much value it for itself. It is something new, and will tend to correct the focus of the Wesleyan ecclesiastical eye-glass. Methodists are so accustomed to look at circuit and district returns that they are liable to look at these exclusively, and to forget that England is divided into counties, or that the work of Methodism can be viewed in relation to these respectively. At any rate, our appreciation of this table is a high one, and as it presents a novel method of return in Methodism we shall notice it a little more particularly than we otherwise should have done.

This table gives us a national view of the Chapel Accommodation provided by Wesleyan Methodism, and its proportion to the whole population of Great Britain. This population

was, according to the census of 1871, 26,216,922; and the accommodation provided by Wesleyan Methodism was, in December 1873, 7,485 chapels and preaching places with 1,723,495 sittings, *i.e.* one to every 15·2 persons of the whole population, or 6·578 per cent. In Scotland, however, Wesleyan Methodism does very little, providing only one sitting for every 161 persons. The population of England and Wales in 1871 was 22,712,266, and that of the Channel Islands and Manxland was 144,638, making together 22,856,904; and for this population Wesleyan Methodism provided 1,702,631 sittings, being one in 13·42, or 7·6 per cent. of the people. And although the population will have considerably increased since the census was taken, yet the proportion will be sustained, if not more than sustained, for one of these tables tells us that in December, 1873, there were 129 chapels with 51,255 sittings, in course of erection, corresponding closely with the number of erections sanctioned at the preceding Conference, which was 135. In 1872, 125 erections with 87 enlargements were sanctioned. And the Report of the General Chapel Committee presented to the last Conference, 1874, informs us, that during the year then closed the committee had sanctioned the building of 130 new chapels and 82 alterations and enlargements. So that, to say nothing of these latter, it is evident that some 390 chapels have been built, or sanctioned to be built, since 1871. And further on we shall show that the rates of progress has of late increased.

Our space will not allow us to give a thorough analysis of this table, for which we had prepared ourselves, but we may just indicate the most salient points in the summary. Notwithstanding its recent effort in the metropolis, which we shall presently notice, Methodism finds its weakest places in Middlesex and Surrey, providing in the former county one sitting for every 46·65 persons, and in the latter, one for every 45·83, or 2·15 per cent. of the population in the two counties. This is low indeed, and justifies the language we sometimes hear about the "Methodist wilderness," especially if we consider that the counties contiguous to these two are also their nearest neighbours in this table. Sussex is provided with one sitting for every 33·31 of its inhabitants: Essex with one for every 29; Suffolk with one for every 25·35; Hampshire with one for 23·85; Hertford with one for 22·79; Berks with one for 22·74; and Kent with one for every 20·39 of

its people. So that, unless other churches are supplying her lack of service, Methodism has need to go "on still toward the south" if she would "go not only to those who want us, but to those who want us most." The opposite projecting point of this summary on the mainland is in Cornwall, where Wesleyan Methodism provides one sitting for every 3·71 persons, and in Lincoln where there is one for every 5·28 of the people. Then comes Bedford with one sitting for every 6 persons, and York with one for every 7·32. Westmoreland follows next with one for 9·63; then Dorset with one for 9·93, and so on till we come to Leicester in the middle of the country, where also we touch the middle of the beam of these statistics, this county fairly representing the average proportion of sittings to the population throughout England and Wales, *i.e.*, one sitting to every thirteen people. The Isle of Man and the Channel Islands are prominent, providing sittings for 20 per cent. of their whole population.

The following Table gives the results found in the divisional groups of counties used in the Census Report of 1871:—

Divisional Groups of Counties.	Population in 1871.	Sittings in Wesleyan Chapels, 1872.	Sittings in proportion to Persons.	Sittings per cent. of Population.
Metropolitan . . . .	3,631,400	78,255	1 to 46·4	2·15
South Eastern . . . .	2,006,909	35,599	1 to 23·44	4·26
South Midland . . . .	1,186,842	97,340	1 to 12·19	8·2
Eastern Counties . .	1,258,961	56,339	1 to 22·25	4·49
South Western . . .	1,879,914	222,517	1 to 8·44	11·84
West Midland . . . .	2,739,473	161,088	1 to 17	5·88
North Midland . . .	1,427,135	171,708	1 to 8·31	12·
North Western . . .	3,380,696	240,327	1 to 14	7·14
Yorkshire . . . . .	2,436,355	332,434	1 to 7·32	13·66
Northern Counties .	1,356,998	111,482	1 to 12·17	8·21
Monmouth & Wales .	1,412,583	117,101	1 to 12	8·33
Channel Islands and Isle of Man . . .	144,638	28,441	1 to 5	20·

This table supports the view we have already given of the south and south-eastern divisions. And it leads us to notice some points of contrast presented by the counties comprised in each group. Thus, in the south midland group, while Hertfordshire has accommodation for only 4·38 per cent. of its population, Bedfordshire has accommodation for 16·66 per cent. of its people; while the other counties of

the group hover around its average. In the south-western division, Cornwall and Devon, lying together geographically, are the opposite points in our calculation, the former providing sittings for 26·95 per cent., and the latter only 7·57. The west midland group presents a very low percentage, 5·88, and only one county in it, Stafford, is above the national average. The north midland is considerably above the average. The north-western, comprising Cheshire and Lancashire, is somewhat disappointing, being a trifle below the average, and it is to be observed that, in the proportion of sittings to population, Cheshire helps Lancashire, not Lancashire, Cheshire. Yorkshire shows itself to be still the home of Methodism, having the highest percentage in the groups. While the northern counties show that whatever Methodism may be in Scotland, she has carried on her work vigorously and successfully up to its very borders.

Turning to glance at the work of Wesleyan Methodism in relation to the density of the population we find our expectations fulfilled: she shows her efficiency in somewhat inverse proportions to the density of the population, but not so as to indicate that her organisation is unadapted to dense populations. In the metropolitan counties where the density is greatest her presence is feeblest, but in the north western counties, the next in density, she attains, within a decimal fraction, the national average efficiency. In the west midland counties, which take the third place as to density, she is below her average; but in Yorkshire, which ranks fourth in density, her percentage of sittings is highest except in the Islands. Then also her next highest percentage is in the north midland counties, which take the *sixth* place as to density; while her next highest percentage is in the south-western division, which is the *tenth* or lowest but one in density. From this view it is clear that no argument can be drawn to show that while Methodism labours successfully among the thinly-scattered people of the country, she is not suited to the work of cultivating the thickly-peopled towns. Indeed, the fact is as we shall show, that of late years she has made more progress among the compact masses than among the scattered people. But, in passing, we may venture to suggest that her Circuit system requires to be modified in order to her full efficiency among the large town populations. Turning over the first of these tables we find large



town Circuits with, in some instances, two large town chapels, and with from ten to fifteen or even more places to be worked by three or four ministers. And the question is very pertinent, How can these ministers find time, and command vigour of mind and body enough, to do that pastoral work, to acquire that personal influence, and to display that pulpit efficiency, which together are simply essential to success among the masses of the people? The consolation is in the answer which the question itself suggests: if Methodism has succeeded so much with such disadvantages as she has sorely felt hitherto, she will succeed much more as she removes these disadvantages by concentrating her energies in proportion to the density of the people. And we are glad to notice that, in London especially, this is being done. Some of the Circuits there have only one, two, or three chapels with two or three mission rooms. Density of population requires concentration of effort; sparseness of population, distribution of effort. Let Methodism illustrate this law in her workings and she will flourish in the towns and in the villages alike.

The art of tabulation is a very difficult one, and of multiplying schedules there is no end. But for the thought of this we should have been disposed to complain of this summary table, which gives us the district view of these returns. We should have preferred *three* schedules instead of two: one giving the number of chapels connexionally settled, in 1851 and 1871 respectively, with sittings, increase, &c.; the second giving rented chapels and other preaching places; and the third giving us the totals with net increase, percentage of progress, &c. As it is, there is, for instance, no column to show the total number of chapels and preaching places in 1851, so that to gain it the reader has to add together the figures in the fifth column of the first schedule and those in the first column of the second, if he would test the net increase as presented in the third column of the first schedule. Thus the first London district is said to have a net increase on 1851 of 76 preaching places; but, running the eye along, we read, chapels in 1851, 94, and to test the correctness of the increase we have to add to the 94 the 28 presented in the first column of the second schedule;  $94 + 28 = 122$ , being the number in 1851, and the number in 1871 being 198, the increase is 76. But, the compiler being, as we suppose, under obliga-

tion, to press the whole into two schedules the summary is presented to us as skilfully and as clearly as it could be. The interest of this summary centres, or more properly, perhaps, culminates, in the last two columns, which give the "percentage of increase on returns of 1851" in the several districts, and the "order of districts in regard of increase." The total net increase on the returns of 1851 for the whole of Great Britain is 1,803 chapels and other preaching places, with 563,942 sittings, or 48·59 per cent. This increase, we find, does not closely correspond with the increase which results from a comparison of the present number of chapels and sittings "with the returns published under Government sanction in 1851." This latter comparison would give a less increase. "It must, however, be borne in mind," says the Wesleyan Committee in its preface, "that when the Religious Worship census of 1851 was taken, many places of worship were included under the designation 'Wesleyan Methodist,' which did not actually belong to the Connexion at that time, but were held by persons who had seceded in the troublous times immediately preceding, and to this fact Mr. Horace Mann calls attention in his report (p. 88)." And that the Census returns of 1851 must have been remarkably high, through some cause or other, anyone may see for himself who will compare the number of Wesleyan Methodist chapels given in those returns with the number given in the Wesleyan Committee's table of counties for 1873. The correctness of the increase as presented to us in this district summary table, is strongly supported by the number of new chapels built during the twenty years between 1851 and 1871 as shown in the committee's last report, at which we shall glance now. Looking, then, at the analysis of this increase, it is pleasing to note that the increase in the Edinburgh and Aberdeen district in the twenty-two years was 60·09 per cent. and that it stands *eleventh* in the order of increase. But it is more pleasing still to note the percentage of increase in the London districts. The second London district is the first in the order of increase. Its percentage is given as 121·68, while the first London (being fourth in the order list) is given as 87·52, being an increase in the two districts of more than cent. per cent. This is the light which shines over against the darkness which obscured the Metropolitan districts as we considered the table of counties; this is the indication of vigour

which tells us that Methodism is not satisfied with the position she has hitherto taken in London and the districts surrounding it, and that she is bent upon improving her position. Indeed it would be withholding justice from the Metropolitan Chapel Building Committee if we did not give as distinct a view as possible of their efforts and success since they received the sanction of the Conference to create a fund for supplying "the lamentable deficiency of Wesleyan Chapel accommodation in the Metropolis." This, happily, we are enabled to do without trouble. The Sixth Report of this Committee, that for 1874, is retrospective, and gives a summary of its labours since the fund was commenced in 1861. The number of chapels built, including two small schoolrooms, and two enlargements is 40, containing sittings for 36,208 persons. In addition to these "70 smaller places of worship, including schoolrooms, iron chapels, and halls, providing 15,634 sittings, have been built or hired, independently of the fund, so that increased accommodation to the extent of 51,642 sittings has been secured in the Metropolitan districts during the last twelve years." The actual cost of the chapels which the committee assisted to build was (say) £230,000, toward which the fund contributed in grants £19,225, and by way of loan £32,445. The scheme thus launched is likely to float and to flourish for some time to come. In 1870 a liberal Methodist offered to give to the Conference and the Connexion "during the next nine years £50,000 on the twofold condition, that provincial friends would contribute £50,000 during the same period; and that fifty chapels, to contain at least a thousand persons each, be actually erected or commenced, in the Metropolis and its immediate neighbourhood." The former part of this condition is more than fulfilled already. The other part of the condition is in course of fulfilment: "We aim at five new chapels every year." And the aim seems to be fairly direct and successful. In 1872 six new chapels were opened; in '73, one; in '74, six; and the Report for this year, presented to the Annual Meeting in May, gives four more chapels as the total number erected, and the number of sittings provided 41,208 as against 36,208 reported last year. £30,000 has been the increase upon the preceding amount reported of cost in chapel-building. "Sixteen sites have been secured by the help of the Committee, on some of which temporary chapels are already erected." And "during the

year special attention has been given to the acquisition of sites in (other) eligible localities."

Turning to the other districts we find that, as a rule, the sittings provided have increased most where the people have mostly resorted. Liverpool is second in the order of increase, having multiplied its sittings at the rate of 107·03 per cent. Bolton comes next with 93·82 per cent. increase. Then Newcastle with 84·90 per cent. Swansea has increased at the rate of 80·98 per cent. Then follow Carlisle, Manchester, Portsmouth, Whitby, and Darlington, Birmingham and Shrewsbury, Macclesfield, &c. Taking the other extreme, the lowest percentage, and working upwards, we find that the increase has been least where Methodism gained early and strong hold, and where therefore her rate of increase in later years should not be expected to be equal to her increase in the years gone by. For, in this as in other matters, progress by its own momentum lessens its proportionate speed: where there is the greatest success at first it is most difficult to sustain the rate or percentage of increase afterwards. This remark, however, does not apply to the Norwich and Lynn district, where the percentage of increase, 16·06, is the lowest. There other well-known causes have acted during the last twenty-five years to explain this comparative minimum of increase. But it applies to Lincoln, which is the lowest but one in its percentage of increase; and to Cornwall which is the next lowest; and to York where the increase is only 28·40 per cent. Still we do not say this to cover the slow rate of progress in these and other districts, or to conceal any causes of it which it would be wise to discover and discuss. We would the increase had been more, and, as no chain is stronger than its weakest link, it would be well for those whom it concerns to look into the state of those districts where the percentage of increase is lowest in order to awaken inquiry and stimulate effort on their behalf. The number of districts in which the increase of sittings is above the average is sixteen, the number in which it is below the average is eighteen. And looking into these districts respectively we do not see that any explanation of this relative increase can be sought in their several peculiar characteristics. Indeed these ecclesiastical districts of Methodism have not very distinguishable features; in calculating the increase for any given district one part of it balances the other. But there

can be no doubt that the adverse inclination is towards the agricultural parts of the land. The percentage of increase is lowest in these, and for this reason among others, that the resident population does not increase in the same proportion as in the large towns and cities. And indeed, looking at the case impartially, we think that 20·06 per cent. of increase in the Lincoln district is quite equal, as an indication of power and progress, to 72·3 per cent. in the Manchester district, for the population of the former is growing slowly, while the population of the latter is growing rapidly. We may venture, then, to suggest here that the difficulty of Methodism in the future will be, not in the large towns,—these will be able to help themselves,—but in the villages and small towns of the country; and that she should seek to multiply her agencies and strengthen her hands in these, for it will be a sadly mistaken policy on her part, and a breach of trust as well, if she confine her attention to the *elite* of the towns and neglect the rustics of the country. And this suggestion derives force from the Returns of Society Membership just made to the District Committees, by which it appears that the few districts reporting decrease are almost exclusively agricultural districts.

The first of these tables, which presents us with a view of all the circuits of Wesleyan Methodism, arranged in their respective districts, and a particular view of every chapel and preaching place in every circuit, with the accommodation it has for worshippers, we must commend to the perusal of our readers. This perusal will teach how various in the number of their chapels and in the area they cover are these circuits; it will teach also what need there is for an increase in the number of her chapels in some places, and especially for the increase of her ministers and agencies everywhere. Just to indicate the former: here is London (Jewin-street) with one chapel and one preaching place; and here is Pocklington, in the York District, with 26 chapels and 7 preaching places. And to indicate the latter: here is London (Paddington) with one chapel to accommodate 380 people; and London (Bethnal Green) with one chapel and two other preaching places, accommodating together 1,299 persons. Now, when we say that the population of Paddington (St. Mary's) is 58,728, and that of Paddington (St. John's) is 38,085, and that that of Bethnal Green is 120,104, we have said enough

to show how painfully serious are the spiritual necessities of London, and to make us very thankful for the efforts which are being made to meet them. Then, looking to Pocklington and other such circuits, we are not surprised that there should be an outcry just now about "Village Methodism" and its claims. Pocklington has *three* ministers appointed to it! We hope it has a very large and a very efficient staff of local preachers. And it must not be thought that this is an exception: our eye chanced to light on Pocklington first. But suppose we take a broader view. The York District has 240 chapels and 110 other preaching places, providing accommodation for 55,606 people. It has 40 ministers appointed to it exclusive of supernumeraries, *i.e.*, one minister to every six chapels, or, including the other preaching places, which in that district are frequently important, one to 8.75 places of worship. The Lincoln District has 261 chapels and 48 other preaching places, accommodating 52,531 persons, with 96 ministers, *i.e.*, one to every 7.25 chapels, or one to every 8.58 preaching places. And when we consider the number of miles these ministers have to travel to their appointments, and the amount of time consumed thereby, we have given, we think, a sufficient answer to everybody who challenges the comparatively small percentage of increase realised in these two districts. In saying this we do not forget the local preachers, nor the value of their labours, which is immense. But when we have made the fullest allowance for their numbers and efficiency and zeal, it must be confessed that the agency of Methodism in these districts is by no means commensurate with the claims of the population, nor even of the Methodist people themselves. And if such is the state of Methodism in these districts, where she is strong, what must be her state, and what her prospects, in some other parts where she is manifestly weak. But we must break away from this subject, though we are strongly tempted to linger.

Our task would not be anything like complete if we failed to call attention to the report of the Chapel Committee mentioned at the head of this paper, and especially to Schedule E. in it. This schedule gives "Summary Tables showing Progress during Twenty Years" in chapel building. During this period no less than 1,923 new chapels arose; the material comfort of ministers was increased by the erection of 164 houses; 558 school-rooms



were built; 492 organs were brought into play; and 1,063 alterations and enlargements were effected. "The entire outlay in the twenty years has been £3,236,053, and 4,200 has been the number of cases." During the same period £1,021,555 of debt have been paid off by aid of grants, loans, and by local efforts. And the total amount contributed in twenty years towards the removal of debt and the cost of new erections and enlargements has been £3,419,919. One of the most pleasing features in this report is the ratio of progress which a comparison of the two decades of this period elicits. Thus, to take the last item, during the first ten years the sum contributed was £1,166,962; during the second ten years it was £2,252,957. The ratio of progress is more fully taught by the following: "In the first decade 709 chapels were built at a cost of £495,927, as compared with 1,214 chapels erected at a cost of £1,659,420 in the second decade." Thus during the second ten years there was an improvement of about five-sevenths on the progress made during the first ten years. And the chapels built during the second period were more costly as well as more in number. The average cost of each chapel built between 1855 and 1864 inclusive, was £699, while the average cost of those built between 1865 and 1874 was 1,202. Then also, the progress during the whole period is presented in another form. "The ordinary income of the fund has steadily increased from £3,885 in 1855, to £9,036 as reported this year. The erections returned as completed twenty years ago were 51, now they are 313; but irregular cases have happily declined, within the same period, from 16 to less than 6 per cent. of the entire number. The annual outlay on account of such erections has increased from £18,295 to £318,108;" being in round numbers an increase of £300,000 (£299,813) in the annual outlay during the twenty years. We heartily congratulate the Wesleyan Chapel Committee and its indefatigable secretaries on these results of their twenty years' enterprise, toil and watchfulness. Their work has been prosecuted in the face of many difficulties, it has been hampered with complications most delicate and intricate, and their firmness to the principles of action which they have established has brought upon them no little obloquy: their principles have sometimes been condemned as illiberal, the methods of the committee have been challenged as unskilful, and even their motives have sometimes been sus-

pected. There are few superintendents of circuits, or even ministers of any standing, who have not, at some time or other, broken a lance with the secretaries. But the labour of the committee has not been in vain, and we dare to predict that it will be more and more highly appreciated by the Methodist people as the years roll on. We deem it no slight compliment to the committee that the "irregular cases have declined from 16 to less than 6 per cent. of the entire number." For this must be due, at least in part, to the widening appreciation of the value of the committee's functions, and of the skilfulness with which those functions have been and are discharged. These results, gratifying in themselves, are also gratifying because they will bear favourable comparison with the progress made by other churches in the same department of work. It is true the Nonconformist Returns represent the Wesleyan Methodist relative increase as small, but then it must be remembered that their returns present to view only a fraction of Wesleyan Methodism: the limited area chosen excludes many more than a million sittings from their calculation, while it only included 351,448 in 1873. Had the whole country been taken we are persuaded the relative increase would have been more, perhaps much more. Speaking of the Church of England, *The Quarterly Review* for July, 1874, says: "Up to the end of 1872 the total number of new churches built in the century was 3,204, of churches entirely *re-built* 925; in all 4,129, without counting restorations and enlargements: *i.e.*, very nearly one-third of all the churches in the kingdom have been built this century;" and "that 1,150, or more than a quarter of these 4,129 new or totally rebuilt churches, have been built in the single decade ending 1872, as against 96 in the twenty years ending 1820, which does not look as if the zeal were dying out." The writer evidently congratulates himself and the Church of England on this progress, and well he may. But how does it stand with Wesleyan Methodism? Why, in the decade ending 1874 no less than 1214 new chapels were built, without counting alterations and enlargements, of which there were 683. On another page the *Quarterly* tells us, that during the decade 1851-1860 the number of churches built was 820. And the Wesleyan Chapel Report tells us that in decade 1855-1864 the number of chapels built was 709. Now, putting these figures together, we find that in twenty-one years, 1851-1872, the

churches built were 1,970, and that in twenty years 1855-1874 the Wesleyan chapels built were 1,923. Of course the chapels would not be anything like so costly as the churches; but so far as building places of worship is concerned, it is clear that, as the zeal of the Church of England is not dying out, so neither is that of the Wesleyan Methodists. And, weighing the two churches fairly in the balance against each other, we must confess to some surprise that the competition in brick-and-mortar progress should be so equal. Would that they lived together in an equal spirit of sympathy in relation to some other questions which it is not our province here to touch.

As we have pursued our course a comparison has been suggested between the increase of chapel accommodation and the increase of members to the Wesleyan Methodist Society. The results of this comparison we will simply state, as it is not our place to draw inferences or to construct arguments for this comparison as a basis. But the results are full of significance, and should be allowed their due weight in the discussion of one or two questions just now before the Conference and the Connexion. The increase of chapels and other preaching places from 1851 to 1873 was 1,803, and of sittings 563,942, or 48·59 per cent. During the same period the increase of members to the Society was 46,371, or 12·035 per cent. only. It should, however, be remembered that this is net increase after supplying the waste caused to the Societies by deaths, withdrawals, &c., so that it would be most unfair to say that this indicates the amount of work done, or success achieved, by the agencies of Methodism. The number of new members received during this period would be five or six times the number of the net increase. For, at the lowest computation 100,000 new members would be required to supply the waste by death alone in the twenty years, the number of deaths reported being, on the average, from 5,000 to 6,000 a year. But the net increase serves our purpose best, because our comparison is between the increase to the living membership and the increase in chapel accommodation. If then we take the ratio of progress indicated by the two decades of the Chapel Report, the difference we just now pointed out appears to be widening. In the first decade 709 chapels were built, and the net increase to the Society membership was 65,500; but in the second decade 1,214 chapels were built, and the net increase to

the Society was only 21,977. So that while in the latter ten years 505 more chapels were built than during the former ten, or an increase of 71·227 per cent., the increase of members was less by 43,523, or a decline in the rate of increase of 66·447 per cent., the disparity being thus represented by 137·674 per cent. If, therefore, we ask, at what rate is Wesleyan Methodism advancing? the reply is, looking at her chapel-building during the last ten years, at an increasing rate of 71·227 per cent. on her progress during the corresponding period immediately preceding; but looking at her Society membership at a decreasing rate of 66·447 per cent. in her progress during the same period. We are thankful to know that this disparity will be lessened by the increase of members reported this year. But it must not be lost sight of. When we consider that Wesleyan Methodism is not wealthy or speculative enough to provide accommodation for public worship which is not likely to be proportionally occupied, and that her ministry is about the last in the land to attract to itself formal worshippers, we must conclude that there is a large amount of living practical godliness which is not represented by her Society membership. However, we leave these figures to make their own impression, contenting ourselves with the remark that the congregations of Methodism grow very much more rapidly than her Societies, and that there is a secret in this worth finding out. In our opinion this fact brightens very much the horizon of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, while she is true and devoted to the one primary purpose of her being—the salvation of men and the diffusion of scriptural holiness throughout the land. Looking at the rise of Methodism, at the rapidity of her growth, at her present position and prospects, at the fact that of late years her growth has been most vigorous in some of the districts where she was and is comparatively weak, at the indications of healthy life which she manifests, at the spirit of enterprise she breathes, and at the disposition we read in her to sing and to say, "*Non nobis Domine,*" we think her ministers and her people may well thank God and take courage.

- ART. VI.—1. *Poems by William Bell Scott*. Ballads, Studies from Nature, Sonnets, etc. Illustrated by Seventeen Etchings by the Author and L. Alma Tadema. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1875.
2. *Hades; or, The Transit and the Progress of Mind*. Two Poems by W. B. SCOTT. London: Printed by J. Last, 3, Edward Street, Hampstead Road. 1838.
3. *The Year of the World; A Philosophical Poem on "Redemption from the Fall."* By WILLIAM B. SCOTT. Edinburgh: William Tait. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1846.
4. *Chorea Sancti Viti; or, Steps in the Journey of Prince Legion*. Twelve Designs by WILLIAM BELL SCOTT. London: George Bell, Fleet Street. 1851.
5. *Poems by a Painter* (WILLIAM BELL SCOTT). London: Smith, Elder and Co., 65, Cornhill. 1854.
6. *Albert Durer; His Life and Works, including Autobiographical Papers and Complete Catalogues*. By WILLIAM B. SCOTT. With Six Etchings by the Author. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1869.

THE recent re-appearance of Mr. William Bell Scott as a poet has been a matter of much gratification to his by no means narrow circle of admirers, who have looked with eagerness for whatever is new or remodelled in this mature collection, announced for some time before it appeared; but besides this, the elegant and artistic-looking volume, with its superlatively excellent etched illustrations, has been a revelation to the younger generation of poetic students who have grown-up since Mr. Scott issued the now unprocurable volumes whereby he is known to readers of maturer years, and known also to such of the younger students as *will* become acquainted with all that is best in contemporary literature, however difficult it may be to gain such acquaintance. For ourselves, we have been long in the pleasant possession of that knowledge, so far as it relates to Mr. Scott, and have hoped for the arrival of the

day when we should have some evidence of his poetic activity during the last twenty years,—some evidence in addition to the poem published a few years ago under the title of “Anthony” in the *Fortnightly Review*. Now that the evidence is before us, we are able to contemplate it with almost unqualified satisfaction; for there is nothing here unworthy of the genius of the poet; and, while we do not find, in quantity, twenty years’ work, we know that the complement exists in Mr. Scott’s doings as painter, etcher, biographer, and critic,—these poetic works being, so to speak, the high-level landmarks of a distinguished career in art and letters.

The satisfaction given by the volume to an old admirer of Mr. Scott’s poetry is mentioned as “almost unqualified,” because, had we omitted the “almost,” we could not consistently have pointed out, as it may be needful to do ere we close, passages of which we prefer the old readings to the new. To take up a volume whereof portions are already long familiar, and find some of the most cherished verses altered almost beyond recognition, is always more or less of a shock; though the reason generally finds an ultimate verdict in favour of the poet’s later judgment. This is usually so throughout Mr. Scott’s definitive collection of those of his poetical works which he most cares to preserve; but there are exceptional cases, to which we shall allude anon. The new volume is richer, more various, more mature than any of the volumes wherein portions of its contents have already appeared; and it affords a higher and truer view of Mr. Scott’s powers as a designer than could be formed from the earlier volumes; for, fine as are some of the etchings in those, the etchings in this are, on the whole, much finer; and they give us a rare taste of the pleasure and profit to be derived from a co-operation of the sister arts of poetry and painting:—we say painting, unreservedly, because we take it that etching, though in itself an art involving but one of the painter’s gifts,—that of design,—is, as a matter of fact, never competently pursued by any man who has not also command of the other gift, colour. Etching is the highest and most perfect method of multiplication by which the painter can express himself; and the only method by which he can make sure that his public shall have, in the printed result, some measure of compensation for the loss of colour.

In the earliest volume by Mr. Scott with which we are



acquainted, he appears in this twofold capacity of poet and painter; and he comes before us redolent of spiritual communion with those two greatest of the "sons of light" who represent, the one English poetry, the other English painting, at the beginning of this century,—Shelley and Blake. Sixteen years after the death of Shelley, it was something of a distinction to so much as recognize his magnificent genius; and Blake was yet, to most people, the mere madman that some would still have him to have been. In 1838, however, Mr. Scott had already chosen his side, and cast in his lot with the idealist and the optimist, with those who never stooped to grovel in the grossly real, who recognize that the most flaming reality is, after all, the reality of the soul's finer perceptions, and who believe with a burning conviction in the perfectibility of human nature.

That poetry should and must be beautiful, to be poetry at all, is the first principle of art; but after that, it is not too much to say that that order of poetry which has convictions and aspirations beyond the realm of the merely pleasureable, is a higher and a nobler thing than that order of poetry which has no mission and no burning belief beyond the languidly lambent flame of a conviction that we live but for the pleasure of the eye and ear, to get what individual joy we can out of the world, and, in the most literal sense, to "go hence and be no more seen." Hence it is that the most perfect poems of John Keats are less high than many of the less perfect of Shelley: such work as the fourth act of *Prometheus Unbound* transcends all work of human hands since the time of Shakespeare, less through perfection of bird-like utterance than through the glory of conviction, and the absolute, radiant sun-light and sun-heat of aspiration after a good clearly seen and ardently worshipped; and he who haunts the green places of the earth, filling them with music and making them appear lovely to the bruised spirit of man, must ever seem a creature of less glory and of straiter aim than he who soars towards "the loftiest star of unascended heaven," and cries on the spirit of man to rise to its full stature, and expand to its full perfection,—cries in such notes as to carry his hearers some measure of the way on his own most luminous track.

It is distinctly to this higher order of poetry that the work of Mr. Scott attaches itself; and it was so from the

first. Contemplative, aspiring, enthusiastic, and full of belief, the feeling that he had a real message to the spirit of man seems ever to be uppermost; but at the same time he has no more of the fatal element of mere didacticism than Shelley himself as a poet, than Blake himself as a painter. *Hades; or, the Transit*, published in 1838, has in it the true ring; and the two designs which accompanied it were perfectly mature, and, though not the least like any particular design of Blake's, were thoroughly worthy of that great spiritual painter. To say that a design is worthy of Blake is, perhaps, a confession of inability to characterize in any other way a style of design so uncommon that it is hard to find a criterion whereby to test it. Those who are familiar with Blake will know at once what is meant, and will understand how high is the praise; those who have not that familiarity would scarcely understand for multiplication of words; and we may admit that some of Mr. Scott's finest poems and noblest pictures are not such as to appeal to a wide circle, any more than Blake's designs or Shelley's most glorious rhapsodies. These are for the intellectual and highly-sensitive few; and so are the best of Mr. Scott's works.

A portion of *Hades; or, the Transit*, very much modified, appears in the volume of poems printed this year; and this new version is called "Music of the Spheres." There are numerous improvements in detail; but also we must admit that some fine passages have been wholly omitted; and we are quite sorry to miss the original opening of *Hades*, with its fine initial couplet,—

"The great Tree of Life with its lustrous flowers,  
Sprang from the nurture of Death's black showers"—

which is decidedly large and striking. Also the admirable mystic etching which represents in both books the *dioscuri* of the intermediate world, whose mission is to remake "the dead men's lives," seems to us preferable in the earlier and simpler form. In *Hades* the etching is little more than an outline, of two solemn, sightless faces, crowned with radiant light, and four exquisitely expressive hands sweeping the strings of two harps that have the expression of being without beginning and without end; the faces are sweet as well as solemn, and the picture, slight as it is, is full of pure light. Now the new treatment of the same subject is much more full and elaborate;

but the faces are less sweet and solemn, the hands less expressive, and the whole savour of the picture rather suggestive of fire than of the intangible and invisible glory of pure light. The other etching in Hades, representing the three dead men in their downward rush from death towards new life, and full of power, finds no place in the new volume.

The valuable and ambitious poem entitled *The Year of the World* is also said to have been accompanied by some designs; but what they were we have been unable to ascertain,—there being, at all events, none in our own copy. Of this poem Mr. Scott has preserved in his new volume but the dedication; but we must not omit to give some account of its scope and aims, especially as, when published in 1846, Mr. Scott attached considerable importance to the philosophic creed it embodied, and gave, in a preface, a clear account of its intentions and of the history of its composition. He says that the first form in which the idea of the poem was embodied, "while the author was very young, was the story of an Athenian youth banished from his native city, and in a state of daring activity of mind being received by a Brahmin, was instructed in the doctrines of Quietism." The conversion of the hero by means of a manuscript somewhat similar to that in *The Year of the World*, called "The Doctrine of Contemplative Absorption," ended the production "satisfactorily to the author's intellectual condition at the time." The second form, composed about the year 1837, "was that of a traveller who journeys round the world. Born in the Temple of Paphos, he grows up in a golden age of happiness, bearing to the votaries the character of Cupid. Suddenly, adolescence disenchanting him and drives him into exertion. He passes through the stages of the Heroic age, or the pursuit of actual experience; the Speculative age, or the grasping at Transcendental good; the age of Reason, which was in a great measure the destruction of what had gone before: and lastly, by the complete mastery of Reason, he attains to a sphere of happiness, which is that of limitation—contentment of the entire nature within the circle of Knowledge. This reached, he suddenly finds himself ministering again in the Temple gardens. This was the Greek age in the author's literary experience." The third and final form was *The Year of the World*; "the ideas which bounded the earlier compositions falling into their appropriate places at the end of the second and third cantos."

The scheme of the poem is described by the author as being "the descent of the soul from a simple and unconscious state into the antagonistic and concrete, and its re-ascent—or the readjustment of the human with the Divine nature, which is the profound idea of all religions and philosophy. The name he has chosen, *The Year of the World*, is the Pythagorean term used two thousand years ago, with much the same significance as it is intended to bear on the title-page of the present work, viz., the entire cycle of time in connection with human history on earth." In the first canto the influences of nature are represented as beings in spontaneous obedience to man (the vital energy) while he remains with his sister (the spiritual) in Eden; but, on the influx of thought, receding from him, to re-appear at the end of the poem in the analogous character of Echoes:—

"Sisters! though we come to him  
In nakedness, he doth not faint;"

and the poem ends with the re-appearance of the spiritual, the active intellect being now harmonized with it. In the meantime, in the second canto, the heroic efforts of Lyremmos, the Energy, are described as thrones raised—first, the invention of artificial fire; after which followed the destruction of wild beasts; agriculture, pasturing, and vine-growing; the distaff; the working of metals; the musical chord and poetry; writing; and plastic art. At the end of the canto "The Doctrine of Contemplative Absorption" is nearly a paraphrase from the Bhagavat Geeta. In the third canto, after he begins to pass westward, the demon voices, or religious myths and formulas, offer to explain the great mystery. These are indications of the cosmogony, &c., of the Hindoos, Egyptians, and more particularly the Chaldeans. The doctrine of Self-Elevation in the canto is an adaptation from the Golden Verses. In the fourth canto the curious ancient story of the pilot hearing the voice on the sea calling out "Great Pan is dead" is introduced among the signs of the approaching advent. The impersonation of Pantheism is visited by the Holy Family; the description of the last being adopted from the pictures of the old masters. The verses expressive of the "Doctrine of Divine Love" are not intended to "do more than indicate the moral activity of Christianity, the writer confining himself wholly to the consideration of man in relation to the earth."

The reader will see that the scheme of this poem is sufficiently ambitious ; and no one who has read it will contest that it betrays powers and poetic idiosyncrasies of a rare and exceptional character ;—above all, that it is distinctly poetic, and not merely versified philosophy : this said, it must be admitted that *The Year of the World* is not a book for general readers, and that Mr. Scott has done not altogether unwisely in excluding it from a volume of miscellaneous poems, many of which have in them the elements of popularity. Let it not be supposed, however, for one moment that we desire to erect popularity as the criterion of excellence in this age of shoddy and dross. True it is that some of the very best poetry of the age is qualified to be, and is, popular ; but equally true that much of the best poetry of every age is only popular in the next age, or ages later still. If Mr. Scott means to leave *The Year of the World* as a legacy to posterity, posterity will certainly claim it sooner or later. Meantime, it must be admitted that he has made his book more *generally* attractive for the present moment without this poem than it would have been with it.

In the matter of sonnets, Mr. Scott has very much enriched his collection, and greatly improved many of those which had been offered to the public already in that charming little book, *Poems by a Painter*. In that, there were but some two dozen sonnets, most of which appear in the present volume, together with a great many more. This division of the poet's work is of considerable importance, first on account of the excellence of the sonnets themselves as examples of that difficult class of composition, full of fine thought, and secondly on account of the fruitfulness of this division of work in those pictorial analogues which add so largely to the interest of the poetry. There is one beautiful group of sonnets with the general title of "Outside the Temple," which the thoughtful reader will never tire of studying, for their beauty and suggestiveness. The first three, as fine as any, are called "Birth," "Death," and "Life;" and the symbolism of these, deep and philosophic, is so clear that we need but transcribe them and leave them to the reader, pointing out, for our own part, the corresponding thoughts expressed with the etching point. "Birth" is as follows :—

"I stood before the vail of the Unknown,  
 And round me in this life's dim theatre  
 Was gathered a whole townsfolk, all astir  
 With various interludes: I watched alone,  
 And saw a great hand lift the vail, then shone,  
 Descending from the innermost expanse,  
 A goddess to whose eyes my heart at once  
 Flew up with awe and love, a love full-blown.  
 Naked and white she was, her fire-girt hair  
 Eddied on either side her straight high head,  
 Swaddled within her arms in lambent flame,  
 An unborn life, a child-soul, did she bear,  
 And laid it on a young wife's breast and fled,  
 Yet no one wondered whence the strange gift came!"

For this particular sonnet Mr. Scott has not given in his new book any pictorial analogue; but if we turn to the volume of etched designs which he issued in 1851 under the title of *Chorea Sancti Viti; or, Steps in the Journey of Prince Legion*, we find the first one after the title-page (itself a fine design) dealing with this subject; there is the great mystic hand up-gathering the vail of the unknown, and there from realms of vague star-light descends the radiant birth-goddess with the unborn life in her arms. The second of this set of sonnets has its analogue also in *Prince Legion*:—

"Again that stage was vacant, that dusk crowd  
 Was murmuring as before: again that hand  
 Gathered the curtain; I saw rise and stand  
 Against the inmost blackness like a cloud,  
 No feature seen, but o'er his brows a proud  
 Spiked crown that held the thick mist clothing him,  
 A strong imperious creature, tall and slim,  
 And hateful too, thus hid within that shroud.  
 Stooping he raised within his long thin arms  
 A scared old man and rolled him up, and fled:  
 And all the crowd shrieked out, and muttering charms,  
 Threw down their fiddle-bows and merchandise,—  
 Around the stark corpse knelt with suppliant cries,  
 Nor ceased still wondering where was gone—the dead!"

But the design in *Prince Legion* varies considerably in detail from this: there again the great hand lifts the vail of the unknown and discloses the realm of dim star-light, up the steps leading to which a shrouded corpse is borne, preceded by the lean and hateful figure of death in an



attitude of the most fantastic and expressive hideousness. The figure of the priest who follows the corpse is distinguished by a book, on the open pages of which we read, "Dust to Dust, and the Spirit to God who gave it." For the illustration of the third sonnet we quit *Prince Legion*: it is as follows:—

"Young men and maidens, darkling, pair by pair,  
Travelled a road cut through an ancient wood:  
It was a twilight in a warm land, good  
To dwell in; the path rose up like a stair,  
And yet they never ceased nor sat down there;  
Above them shone brief glimpses of blue sky,  
Between the black boughs plumed funereally,  
Before them was a faint light, faint but fair.

Onward they walked, onward I with them went,  
Expecting some thrice-welcome home would show  
A hospitable board, and baths and rest;  
But still we looked in vain, all hopes were spent,  
No home appeared; and still they onward go,  
I too, footweary traveller, toward the West."

The analogue to this is in the volume now specially under notice, and is one of the most beautiful designs here: it has a grand simplicity that is something more than severe; and it is hard to say why it is so much more impressive than the mere representation of four young couples walking between two hedgerows might be expected to be. Certainly the violence of the perspective and the unusual symmetry of the arrangement set one looking for a meaning; and the artist has made his meaning perfectly clear by writing under the design the single word "Whither?"

The series of sonnets called "Parted Love" attach themselves naturally to those called "Outside the Temple,"—only being more personal in expression, and not less general in spiritual application. One or two of them are exceptionally perfect, as for instance that entitled "The Present." These stand in artistic contrast with the third set of sonnets, "The Old Scotch House," which are more picturesque and less profound,—though always thoughtful, too. The quaint corner of the "Old Scotch House," which is at Penkill, Ayrshire, makes a pleasant picture, with its Scotch firs and its knowing jackdaws: we have seen this as an oil-painting; and it now appears in the book as an etching,—very charming and fresh in treatment, but not with that depth and suggestiveness that is perhaps the most remarkable

quality of Mr. Scott's work. The garden of the "Old Scotch House" appears here as well as a sample of its architecture: the view is taken from the interior of a trellised summer-house; and here the highly poetic symbolism goes side by side with the beauty of composition and workmanship. A lady sits on the rude seat within the bower, with her beautifully turned head and cheek in bright sunlight: her eyes are turned away,—she is looking through the rustic arched doorway of the house up the trim path of the garden, at the end of which stands a single cypress-tree, black against the lighted background of leafage; and it is on that emblem of death, one feels at once, that the lady's gaze is fixed. This exquisite little picture is directly connected with the sonnet on the page opposite it, opening with the three lines,

"Happiness sometimes hath a tinge of dread,  
Perfection unconditioned, strange indeed,  
As if at once the green leaf, flower, and seed."

But the sad beauty of the picture attunes the mind equally to the song in this series which immediately follows it, under the title of "Autumn Sunshine:"—

"Now week by week the scattering leaves  
Drift down the sheltered lane,  
And week by week the sharp wind grieves  
The tree-tops with the rain.

"But clouds to-day have cleared away,  
The sun shines warm and strong  
On cot and farm, on hedge and way,—  
'Tis a holiday worth a song.

"The air is bland on face and hand,  
Returned the mid-year hath;  
The saddened flowers their hearts expand,—  
Simmers the garden-path.

"The spotted emperor, seldom seen,  
Is the sunflower's bosom friend;  
The dragon-flies flicker across the sheen,  
Where the yellow flag-leaves bend.

"But the shooter is heard upon the hill,  
The robin is by the door,  
The curlew cries o'erhead so shrill,  
The swallows are seen no more.

"And this is the last last crimson day  
The exhausted sun can send;  
The evening falls, our foot-path way  
Turns homeward towards the end."

The "Sonnets on Literary Subjects" contain some admirable examples of poetic criticism: the estimate of Wordsworth is very keen and just, and is finely expressed in three sonnets; the epitaph of Hubert Van Eyck is inimitable; and the sonnet on the inscription of Keats's tombstone, excellent in itself, affords a good reason for decorating this series with a perfect etching of the poet's grave in the Protestant burial-ground at Rome. The graves of Shelley and Keats formed the subjects of two companion pictures of great beauty painted by Mr. Scott, at Rome, in the summer of 1873; and we are glad to see one of them reproduced here; but the one not here is finer still than this,—the objects around the grave of Shelley, the pyramid of Caius Sestius, the yew-trees planted by Trelawny about the "heart of hearts," the acanthus in full bloom, the very tombstones round about, all being so disposed as to carry the eye inevitably up towards that glorious blue Italian sky under which the noblest of Shelley's works were written, and which is itself the most fitting symbol of the rare spiritual ether to which his soul incessantly aspired.

An important section of the poet's work comes under the head of ballad-poetry; and here he occupies a peculiar position. With the exception of Mr. Rosetti's "Sister Helen" and "Eden Bower" we know of no modern ballads which can compare with Mr. Scott's for perfect combination of the quaint and picturesque directness of the old ballad poetry with modern subtlety and depth of intention. In *Poems by a Painter* there were several of these beautiful compositions,—the most perfect being "Woodstock Maze," with its alternating refrains so admirably adapted to the contrasted gaiety and tragedy of the subject; but the longer composition entitled "Four Acts of St. Cuthbert," though less perfect, showed in its early form a more decided power and originality. The etching which represented Cuthbert occupied with his scanty crop of corn, and in parley with the birds, who understood that they must not disturb the saint's property, has disappeared; and so too has the corn disappeared from the new version of the ballad. This brings us on one of the alterations to which

we cannot get reconciled ; we have always found something peculiarly gracious in the two stanzas—

“ With that he worken in the earth  
And sowed his corn with care ;  
And when the small birds gathered round  
They understood his prayer ;  
“ And lifting up their beaks unfed,  
Went quietly away,  
Also the craiks and buzzards brown  
Came not again that way.”—

and such is the intensity of impression conveyed by these simple heartfelt things, whether verbal or pictorial, that we had become quite attached to the craiks on the top of the hut by the sea, and the “buzzards brown” circling round in the windy sky. However they are abolished from the text of the new version :—

“ With that he worken in the earth  
And sowed his onions there ;  
And when the crows and sea-mews came  
They understood his care ;  
“ And lifting up their beaks unfed,  
Flew silently away ;  
Also the mermaids, devils and wraiths,  
They came no more that way.”

The one thing that wanted altering was, not the ornithology, —though doubtless Mr. Scott has been reminded by some knowing naturalist that his buzzards were out of place, being birds of prey,—but the misused syllable “en” in “worken ;” and that is left as it was,—in a place where “workèd” would have answered the purpose precisely and would not have savoured of affectation. As for the onions, it may be a gross prejudice, but we cannot overcome the conviction that onions are somehow unpoetic vegetables.

Of the two important ballads which appear in Mr. Scott's new volume for the first time, we prefer the second, as being, altogether, though simpler, a higher work of art. “The Lady Janet, May Jean,” which takes the place of honour, and is illustrated by Mr. Tadema, less excellently than the author would have illustrated it himself, represents a feverish spiritual struggle, and is very highly elaborated, both in form and in thought ; but the motives in it are more subtle

and complex than the average reader will care to follow out, the conflict of shame and love, of right and wrong, painfully dwelt on with but little thread of action, barely pleasurable enough to impress itself aright on the imagination. Not so "Kriemhild's Tryst," the second ballad, which is simple at once in motive and in treatment, full of human passion and the wild life of things peopling the borderland between the real and the ideal, clear and straightforward in action, and carrying in every verse a conviction of that retributive element in life which dogs the heels of wrong so unerringly. Through this clear inevitableness of the climax the tragedy is shorn of its overplus of pain, and the poem leaves the mind in the possession of a thing of great beauty and solid worth. This ballad may be classed as a variant of the Lurley legend,—*"Childe Eric"* being waylaid on his way to his betrothed Kriemhild, by one of those wild innocent women of the water-folk, ignorant alike of law and of wrong, who adorn so graciously the poetry of the middle ages :—

"Oh, she was lissom and fond and strong,  
Guileless and wild and free ;  
Nor had she even a thought uncouth  
Lying under the rowan tree.

"He was Eric the tall, from Mickle-garth,  
Her husband and paramour ;  
And she was a wife now, body and soul,  
So thoughtful and demure."

Of course he tires of the half-human partner thus gathered by chance, and after a time goes on his way to keep his tryst with Kriemhild ;

"But he had sworn he would return,  
Return to the May, had he,  
With a ring, and a necklace, and girdle-gold,  
And long-lawn and cramoisie."

And here in this simple and, alas, too common breach of faith is the seed from which his death must grow. He finds Kriemhild among her maidens ; but his doom pursues him ; and as he sits with his betrothed, the innocent song of the maidens serves but to show the division of lives of which he only knows the fatal secret :—

- " Therewith a cry shot over them,  
As it came from out the sea,—  
The cry of a woman in sharp despite,  
Crying, 'Ai, woe is me!'
- " The hail it flashed on bench and board,  
By a loud wind borne along;  
The singers fled within the bower,  
And thrust the bolt so strong.
- " And there the lady Kriemhild sat,  
Childe Eric by her side,—  
Together sat they hand in hand,  
But their eyes were turned aside.
- " And the damsels knew as she sat so still,  
With never a welcome word,  
Their ditty had shorn between them  
As it had been a sword.
- " They too were foster-children once,  
Their love too had been strong,—  
Can what hath passed return again  
Like the burden of a song?
- " For Love descends with a great surprise,  
An angel on our cold floor;  
And he never should leave us, never again,  
For we're colder than before.
- " Was this the boy she played with once  
Come from the great war's game,  
More learned too than a priest, 'twas said,—  
While she remained the same?
- " It seemed as she sat, long miles away  
Some wedding-bells rang out;  
But whether for her or for some other bride,  
She mazed herself in doubt.
- " Whose were they if they were not hers?  
Some dream she would recall;  
But the gathering thunder swept them out  
And shook the wainscot wall.
- " Then again that wild lamenting cry,  
'Ai, oh, woe is me!'  
Severed the air like a fiery lance;—  
Nor could she choose but see  
It went right through him like his doom,—  
'Ai, oh, woe is me!'



"And with it rolled a surge of waves  
All round the bower outside ;  
A knocking smote the bolted door,  
The voice behind it cried :—

" 'Come back to me, Eric, I am now  
A woman with love in store ;—  
Why went you while I slept ?—my hair  
Is not now as heretofore.

" 'It clings so heavy and cold and wet,  
Oh, hasten, and bring with thee  
The ring and the necklace and girdle-gold,  
The long-lawn and cramoisie !

" 'My guardian and my husband sworn,  
Return again to me,  
And these sea-waters will go back,  
Back safe into the sea.

" 'The rain it runs down breast and thigh,—  
For thee I am so brave :  
I would not that mine ancient kin  
Shall make the floods thy grave !'

"The gentle Kriemhild and her maids  
Together stood quite still,  
Stood altogether listening  
To the voice so wild and shrill.

" 'Childe Eric, oh my long-betrothed,  
Who is this calling so ?'  
'Alas ! I know not nor can tell,  
And you must never know.'

" 'My sweet bower-maidens, tell me true,  
Who is it calleth him ?'  
'I see,' quoth Joan, 'by the window-pane  
A brown sea-serpent swim——'

" 'But we must mount the topmost steps,  
The flood-waves rise so high,—  
'I cannot move,' Childe Eric cries ;  
'I must remain to die.'

"With that she fell upon his neck,  
She would not leave him there ;  
But her damsels raised her in their arms,  
And clomb the higher stair.

"And as they climbed they heard below  
 The door wide open fly;  
 Then all at once the darkness broke  
 Across the rending sky,

"And struggling strongly out, they saw,  
 Amidst the coiling spray,  
 A long-haired woman's shining arms,  
 Wherein Childe Eric lay!

"And faintly came again that cry,  
 'Al, oh, woe is me!  
 Where is the ring and the girdle-gold,  
 The long-lawn and cramoisie?'"

The simple ballad-verse of this composition, with the significant and artistic recurrence of the water-woman's cry for the promised tokens of human wife-hood, is admirably varied midway by the song of Joan and Claribee and the dialogue in short couplets between Eric and Kriemhild, immediately preceding what we have just quoted. It will also be noticed by those who read the whole of the ballad, how much some parts of it, unquoted, are indebted to the other faculty of the artist, the painter's faculty for observing colour and form, and seizing on whatever is shapely and pleasant of hue, to make his poem vivid in detail. But this is the case with a great part of Mr. Scott's poetry, and notably with the ballad division of it; whereby it comes about that we get the power of two arts in one, even when the artist does not illustrate with the etching point. When he does do this, it is not generally done in so direct a manner as to be a repetition in lines of what is already said in words, but rather so as to give an extension or analogue to the thought of the text. The most *direct* illustrations in the new volume are those of Mr. Tadema, four in number, and one by Miss Boyd. Mr. Tadema's add no thought to what is expressed in the text; but they repeat the text well; and so does Miss Boyd's "*Incantation of Hervor*," which renders very happily the weird scene in which Hervor receives her dead father's sword, when—

"A white light oozed from out the tomb. . . .  
 The turf was rent, and the black earth yawned."

This design of Miss Boyd's is exquisitely etched by Mr. Scott.

As a painter in the fullest sense, Mr. Scott appears but seldom before the public, having, as some of those painters to whose genius his is most nearly allied have, a private *clientèle* among whom his best works in oil and water-colour get distributed without passing through exhibitions. Substantially, the etchings of which we have given some slight account, have been the only means whereby the public could form a judgment of his powers as a painter; and, perfect in quality and subtle in design as most of them are, they do not, and obviously cannot, show so accomplished an artist at his best. Some few pictures have from time to time found their way into London exhibitions; and whatever we have seen there has been worthy of the high position of Mr. Scott as a poet. But the best paintings we have seen of his have not been exhibited at all; and the noble composition which has made the deepest impression upon us is one dealing with a profound and beautiful subject from the Bible,—the temptation of Eve. It is a large picture in water-colours,—fine alike in thought, design, and colour. The mother of men stands naked but for the radiant robing of her hair, beside the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, in parley with the serpent, who is painted, not as the old masters so often represented him, with a woman's head, but with the face and arms of an infant. In the beautiful twilight of the as yet sinless and curseless garden, the seemingly impregnable innocence of the woman's white flesh shines lustrously in contrast with the brilliant green scales of the serpent and rosy simulation of innocence with which it ends among the leaves and fruits; and we read the doom of man in the yearning beautiful face of the woman not yet a mother,—not yet endowed with the fatal knowledge of good and evil. But we shall perhaps fail if we attempt, in prose, to make clear the bearing of a picture whose thought is strictly poetic; and our readers will probably, as far as they may realize a picture without positively seeing it, realize it more fully from the following sonnet than from anything we can add in prose:—

"The brightness of the unfallen flesh of her  
Glitters against the twilight: lily leaves  
Shrink dim beside its radiance: even Eve's  
Gold shower of taintless tresses blooms less fair

Than Eve's unsullied silvery limbs. What snare,  
Of all the approved hid nets the serpent weaves,  
Shall catch that flower-like perfectness he grieves  
To abide beside, and soil it unaware?

Shall not the covert mother-instinct spring  
Promptly to serve his turn? Shall she not, seeing  
Some snake-like small reflex of her own being,  
Take in good faith such fruit as it shall bring?  
Babe's face, babe's arms, above the snake's lithe sprawl:  
And the white mother of men shall yearn and fall."

This picture, at once poetic and religious in the best sense in which a picture can be so,—that is to say by virtue of thought and feeling subtly transfused into the full-blooded veins of beauty, whereby the lustrous body of Art speaks without words to the spirit of man,—this rendering of a subject in the highest range of subjects amenable to the laws of painting, should be enough to secure its creator, forever, an honourable place among the painters of England, though no one who knows his etchings, and has seen the admirable designs for the windows of the pottery gallery at South Kensington, can doubt his title to such a place. This "Eve" is altogether inseparable from its colouring; and probably Mr. Scott has done wisely in giving no representation of it among the etchings which add so much to the value of his beautiful book of this year. The colouring is too fine and altogether too significant to be entrusted to the imperfect representation of the finest possible etching,—even to such etching as the portrait of Albert Durer at the age of twenty-eight, in Mr. Scott's excellent life of that artist, or as the wonderful plate which forms the title-page of the blank verse "Studies from Nature," in the new volume of poems,—a plate in which the etching-point has done all that it possibly can to express the various textures of flowers and leaves, feathers and insects, flesh and bark, and in which everyone who aspires to the study of nature, whether as painter or as poet, may learn just such a lesson of right and thoughtful observance as he may gather from the perfect rectitude and clear precision of the "Studies" themselves. Of these, the best are reprinted from *Poems by a Painter*; and they have, perhaps, been more quoted than anything Mr. Scott has written. We should, on the whole, value the ballads and sonnets more highly than the nature-studies

in blank verse; but these it would be difficult to over-estimate,—such poems as “Green Cherries,” “Sunday Morning Alone,” and “The Duke’s Funeral” being of such clear-cut precision of thought and speech as to compare favourably with the finest of Mr. Tennyson’s short idyllic pieces in blank verse. Also they are so broad in thought as to be a real possession for the mind; and while their keenness of observation in matters of outward detail makes them fit well to the general title of *Poems by a Painter*, the higher qualities that underlie every vividly shown scene or incident leave them in undisputed possession of the correlative title of “pictures by a poet.”

---

ART. VII.—*Minutes of Several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers in the Connexion established by the Rev. John Wesley, A.M., at their Hundred and Thirty-second Conference begun in Sheffield on Wednesday, July 28th, 1875. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1875.*

For some time past each Annual Conference of the old Methodist Body has had its prominent question of interest, more or less absorbing attention at the time, and rendering it important in subsequent history. If we were asked what was that element of special moment in the recent assembly at Sheffield, we should at once say: The unity of the Ministerial Brotherhood, as annually represented in the Conference. We are not referring, however, to any one particular demonstration on the subject. But that idea—the nature and conditions and value of the organic Unity of the Body—seems to a thoughtful observer the key to most of the proceedings which were outside of the ordinary routine. At any rate, we shall occupy a few pages of this quasi-Methodist review with a few illustrations of that principle in its threefold bearing: first, on the relation of the Conference to the people; secondly, on the internal spirit and temper of the Conference as a brotherhood of ministers; and, thirdly, on the organic relation to other bodies and the external world generally.

From the time that the Head of the Church called into existence this people who were not a people, it has been governed by a ministerial presbyterate. During the days of the founder of Methodism, the societies had not assumed that churchly form which it is the law that all Christian communities must assume. They were societies, or a society belonging to the Church of England; somewhat similar to many societies which had arisen and flourished in the Catholic Church from the beginning. We all think—both within and without the Established Church—that it would have been the wisdom of that Church to have nourished and cherished Methodism: making concessions, large concessions, rather than precipitate separation or render it necessary. Nothing was demanded for a long time which has not since been granted in other forms: most of the irregularities which gave offence at the outset, inexpiable offence, have been since admitted, con-



doned, and even honoured. But God seeth not as man seeth. His judgment was not as our judgment. It is not for us to doubt that by the Divine will this Body has been added to the denominations of the present Catholic Church. That question we have nothing to do with just now. What we would impress is that, from the time of John Wesley's departure—which was almost simultaneous with the full ecclesiastical organisation of the Body—Methodism has been a purely Presbyterian organisation. It has retained in England, and notably in America, many elements of the primitive episcopate. It has retained many strong points of the Congregational system, whether as respects the independence of every separate society or its congregational voice in the choice of its office-bearers. But it has been, and is essentially, Presbyterian; and it is of the essence of Presbyterianism—first, that the Church is governed by the presbytery; and, secondly, that that government keeps ever in view a systematic representation of the ministerial and lay orders of Christian people; and, thirdly, that that representation extends to the combination of churches in a connexional form.

The second of these principles divides Presbyterianism into two branches: one which introduces the laity into the Presbyterial body by their representatives, set apart and ordained to the function of presiding over the Church, conjointly with those who labour in the word and doctrine; and another which adheres to the New Testament, which, in its judgment, has no lay-presbyters appointed and ordained for the government of the Church. This form of Presbyterianism makes other provision for the representation of the general body of Christians; and that in various ways. It—or let us say Methodism, as this is a very general statement, and does not enter into the dogmatical or historical discussion—has many ways of giving the Church of Christ a share in the government over itself. It unites the laity with itself representatively by assigning them offices of teaching, preaching, guiding detachments of the people in things Divine, administering all financial affairs, co-assessorship in all committees, government of all organisations appointed by the Church; in short, in every way possible short of giving them what the Redeemer does not give them, the final oversight and rule of the flock.

For three-quarters of a century, through good report and through evil report, the Conference has existed as the

governing body of the Methodist societies and of the Methodist Church. During that time it has stood almost alone in Christendom as a representative of the New Testament theory of the ministerial oversight of the flock. It has had to defend itself again and again; but has always triumphed. The Methodist Body have been hitherto well content. Such have been the limitations and safeguards, such the care taken to maintain inviolate the New Testament ecclesiastical ethics, that the constitution has approved itself by its successful working. The Conference has reserved to itself simply the prerogatives of New Testament eldership. It has practically shown what the *Potestas clavium*, or Power of the keys, is when scripturally interpreted. And it may be fairly said that this ecclesiastical court has worthily represented the twofold theory of Church government. It has never forgotten that the elders are made overseers by the Holy Ghost, and are supremely responsible to the Head of the Church. And it has been equally mindful that the whole Church is the depositary of all Christian authority, and that the ministry receive that authority as the representatives of the Church's power. Hence the Conference has at once represented the Lord and His flock.

There are some who will not be convinced that the people are represented in their own government, and in the general administration of Christ's kingdom, unless they see the actual representatives of the people sitting, as such, in the highest ecclesiastical judicature. But the New Testament never countenances that kind of democratic church government. Our Lord does indeed declare concerning His Church, then represented by the Apostles, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it as maintaining the good confession. He gave His own Key, the key of David, or the keys as including both admission and exclusion, to that Church; but only that the Church might, like Himself, give that authority to its representatives, represented by Peter. The ministry are set apart to represent the Church by the act of the Church itself; and that only concurs with the Saviour's will. All authority over all things religious does truly reside in the witnessing Church—even with only two or three He is in the midst confirming its acts—but that Church appoints its own representatives in its ministry whom the Spirit calls and ordains. The ruling eldership expedient is a dexterous

method of compromise, by which the Church commits all its ample prerogatives to its ministry, and yet will have its own lay presence conjoined with them. But there is no sanction for this in the New Testament; at least, that is the contention of the Methodist people, who are not troubled with any doubt on that question. They understand by the presbytery the ministerial presbytery pure and simple. They know nothing of the compromise which will have the prerogative and responsibility of eldership and the freedom and independence of the laity in one. They know nothing—in many cases literally, for they do not understand the point—of the composite of pastor and flock in the person of an elder who only rules and does not teach. The Methodist theory admits the concurrence, and co-assessorship, and presence and counsel of the laity actually in every stage but the last, and virtually even in that. And it has no misgiving or suspicion that it fails to do justice to the scriptural standard according to which the “brethren” are always included with “the apostles and elders.” They who defend the stricter theory remember that whereas “the apostles and elders and brethren send greeting,” the decrees were “ordained of the apostles and elders” (Acts xvi. 14), to whom indeed Paul and Barnabas had been sent, and not to the brethren also, in their mission of consultation (ch. xv. 2). Gathering up the will and wishes of all the people, and having on all peculiar regulations their express concurrence, in order to make their laws valid, the elders in the Conference may publish to the world all their decrees, and say, “The elders and brethren send greeting.” In its pastoral addresses to the flock it has for a long series of years adopted the very tone of the New Testament elders. We know of no Christian community the governing body of which so perfectly reproduces that tone. A comparison—which we are almost tempted to institute—with whatever of the same kind issues from other assemblies and unions and convocations might be invidious. It is enough to say that it is the honest and consistent and real expression of an authority claimed and conceded, or rather well understood without being either claimed or conceded: the reality of which is the very life of the bond between the Conference and Methodism generally.

It is generally supposed by those who look on from without that the time has come for such a remodelling of the

Conference as may conform it to the more liberal tendencies of the age: in other words for the introduction of the lay element into the Conference proper. This notion seems to be very popular at present. Apparently a considerable number of the ministers of the body are in favour of the change: some because it has a flavour of liberality about it; some because it is symptomatic of healthy mobility and life, that is of non-stagnation; and some seemingly because they are tired of the large and miscellaneous attendance at the Conference, which of course its stricter representative character would effectually suppress. The Nonconformist communities hail the approaching change with a patronising delight. So do the Broad parties in the Church of England; and with them, we cannot help thinking, those to whom the ministerial exclusiveness of the Methodist final courts is a perpetual reproach: not so much because they theoretically disapprove of it, but because it is a silent condemnation of their own abandonment of ministerial rights.

We do not intend directly to plead on either side of this question at present: for the sufficient reason that before these pages will be in the reader's hands the subject will be under very earnest consideration in committee. But a few observations may be appropriately made at the present time, which may tend to disabuse the public mind of one or two misconceptions as to the bearings of this important change.

In the first place it ought to be remembered that the admission of laymen into Conference is not advocated by any Methodists in the sense in which that phrase is generally understood outside of Methodism. Each word of the term "Laymen in Conference" must be examined, and as it were defined, in order to arrive at what is desired among the laity and what the Conference is asked to concede. Such an examination we must make, however briefly, in order to obviate the appearance of inconsistency, after having said so much as to the tranquil and satisfied acceptance of the ancient relations between pastor and people as established among the Methodists.

It is idle nowadays to contest the propriety of the term laity. It is a conventional word, which is well understood, and can do no more harm than its correlative Clergy or the title "Reverend," or others which may be used to designate it. Many of those who are clamouring for the

admission of laymen into the Conference—we speak now of those without rather than of any within—seem to think that their admission would effect some strange change upon them: in other words, that they would be taken out of the category of the people generally or the governed, and placed in that of the eldership or the governors. But nothing of that kind is contemplated in the projected plan. Those who are to be sent to the Conference will be, just as they are now in the Committees of Review, men elected for this specific purpose, to occupy a new position for this once and then resume their place. Now, without saying a word as to the propriety of adopting any such plan, we may say that this is an anomaly in itself, and especially an anomaly in the Methodist theory of the Conference. There is nothing precisely like it among the churches of God; nor has there ever been. In ancient and modern Councils and Synods laymen have been present for some specific reason: present and silent, or at least speaking under peculiar restrictions. It has already been seen that among all the Presbyterian communities of Calvin's platform, they are present but as ordained and acknowledged, though generally subordinate—to say the least—members of a divinely ordered governing body. Hence their own aversion to the name "Lay-elders," and preference for that of "Ruling-elders." In other communities which have renounced the doctrine of a ministry in the church independent of the pastorship of a church, of course the laity are supreme: the ministry are laity *quoad hoc*. Such of them, however, as retain the Presbyterian idea of the representation of churches in a connexion or otherwise send their laity in full force for the government of the whole Body. Between their theory and practice,—it may be said in passing—and that of the "Old Body," there is a wider difference than exists between Methodism and any of the communities already mentioned. Hence—to return—if the laity were admitted into the Conference, simply as laymen, and without any legislative or administrative powers generally, it would be an absolutely new thing. Now Methodism has introduced some new things: it has had its full share both of the dignity and of the odium of innovation. But this would be a too daring experiment.

Again, the next word in the term demands consideration. It is proposed to admit laymen into the Conference and give them a place in it; but not to make them a component

part of the Conference. This is stating the anomaly above referred to in another form. The lay members would be delegates sent to the Conference; but not representatives of the people in it. They would appear for a season, and then retire: thus occupying a position which they ought not to be permitted to occupy; one, in fact, which the members themselves ought not to tolerate. Nor would they be really and truly in the Conference. They would attend only certain sessions of it. In no sense whatever would they really compose part of the Conference. Entering it after the proceedings had begun, and leaving it probably before the final confirmation, they would be members of it only by a strange construction of the term. They would be members of a committee appointed by the Conference to sit at certain times: a committee of the whole house, as it were, with certain additions for the occasion. Against such a conference within the Conference, or such a combination of conference and committee, many things have been said that it is needless to recall. It certainly appears, on a first consideration, equally derogatory to the unity and integrity of the Conference itself, and to the dignity and independence of the lay element thus brought in.

This discussion has led to remarks which seem as if they forget that this is not the immediate question to be considered. There is a scheme which may be regarded as an alternative: a scheme which has the priority in the order of consideration, and should be considered in all its bearings before the other is even thought of. It is that of the reconstruction of the preliminary committees in such a manner as to make them a final representation of the mind of the laity in all questions and in all causes which the laity have fairly to do with. They would then be a Preliminary Diet, or Mixed Conference, the decisions of which—limited to matters that do not involve the government of Christ's Church as such, but excluding nothing that pertains to the well-being of the Society apart from that—should be formal and definitive: precisely in the same sense, that is, as all the decisions of the Conference are final and definitive before the ratification of the Conference proper. This week of the Ante-Conference would be of immense importance in the regulation of Methodist affairs. It would not be a committee of the last Conference, but would meet under its president, strengthened by the experience of the year.



We confess that this plan seems to us on many grounds preferable. It makes a fair show of avoiding the great perils with which the other would be fraught. It would be mere affectation to deny that there would be considerable danger in the adoption of that one. Not indeed—to our apprehension at least—the precise kind of danger which has been often dwelt on, that of depriving hundreds of young ministers of the great advantage of a conference education and training. Whatever benefit may accrue to the two or three hundred who attend mainly to show and deepen and enlighten their interest in Methodist affairs is counterbalanced by other evils of a serious character. One of these is obvious: the impossibility of preserving the decorum and carrying out the design of a deliberative assembly when six or seven hundred are gathered together, many of them undisciplined in the graces that belong to such a synod. At times when subjects of peculiar importance are discussed, and when much excitement is kindled by the debate, this evil becomes very marked. Its existence does not reflect discredit on any: it has from the beginning been a necessary concomitant of large ecclesiastical meetings. But it is very much to be deplored. And the expression of it would have been much more marked during the last three or four years of the Conference had they not been presided over by very able Presidents.

The real danger would lie proximately in the almost absolute impossibility of separating questions involving the deepest spiritual interests of the societies from their financial and merely economical affairs, and ultimately in the probability that in times less tranquil and reasonable than our own the compact which limits the attendance of laymen to certain parts of the Conference should be resented, questioned, and reversed. That compact itself would of course be a precedent for such a proceeding. There would be no danger at present; at least, there is nothing now apparent that would warrant a contrary assertion. Remarks were made in debate which seemed to imply that on the part of some laymen there was the beginning of a tendency to bring within lay jurisdiction things pertaining to the doctrine and worship of the Church. We do not share that suspicion, and have already affirmed our conviction that Methodism is rooted and grounded in the belief that, on the one hand, Christ has appointed a body of men and made them responsible to Himself for the

maintenance of His truth and the preaching of it; and that, on the other hand, the universal rights of the Church as "the pillar and ground of the truth," are, by the act of the Church itself, in harmony with that appointment of the Head, given over to the body of men whom she selects out of her own members and sets apart to be the trustees of her rights.

Another aspect of the united function of the Conference as a body is that which looks towards external communities. This has had a special emphasis during the sessions at Sheffield. A very formal reception was accorded to certain Nonconformist ministers, with special reference to their representative character as Nonconformists; a great deal of attention was given, though not in so complacent a spirit, to the relation of Methodism to the Established Church; and the somewhat unusual course—some thought and said the superfluous course—was adopted of passing a resolution asserting the friendly policy of the Conference towards all legitimate efforts for promoting the mutual recognition of evangelical churches as such.

The peaceful current of feeling towards other bodies did not flow, however, with an absolutely unruffled surface. It is well known to those who were present in the Conference, and not quite unknown to those who glanced at the reports of its doings, that there was a very animated discussion on the question of relaxing certain old written and unwritten statutes which fettered the action of the ministers in relation to matters of political interest, and especially as concerns the union of Church and State. It was pretty well understood that the political questions interdicted were those which related to the pre-eminence of the National Church, and the public meetings which it was forbidden to attend were meetings of the Liberation Society.

It was simply a coincidence that this vexed question came up just at the time when the minds of Methodists generally, ministers and people, are more or less irritated by many recent manifestations of intolerance on the part of the clergy. But it hardly need be said that this feeling had nothing to do with the conduct of the discussion. It simply brought out into sharp expression what has always existed, the fact of a division of opinion among the ministers as to the religious policy which the Connexion ought to be governed by; and the strongest argument used against those who claimed the liberty of assaulting the Establish-

ment was that such conduct must infallibly lead to divisions among the brotherhood and discord among the societies. The case was rightly regarded as a special one; and, while there seemed to be in the issue an indirect relaxation of the old unwritten law of non-intervention, the Conference declared that it holds and would hold every man responsible for the maintenance of peace and for every breach of the unity of the brotherhood which might result from attending meetings for agitation. It is very observable that all the stress was laid upon the importance of preserving inviolate the unity of the body; and very observable also that the honour and loyalty of every member was appealed to and is to be relied upon.

After all this is the true principle. The body of Methodist preachers is one. The bond of its unity is one which can hardly be explained. It is not enough to say that it is the common sentiment of devotion to the interest of Christ's kingdom. Besides this there is a peculiar bond of brotherhood which has scarcely its parallel in the present day or in the history of Christendom. It is not like the mechanical and rigid unity of the Jesuit body: its freedom of action is the perfect contradiction of that. It is equally far from the intangible and unreal bond which seems to link—though it does not—some modern societies and fellowships that need not be named. The secret of its unity cannot altogether be told. But this may be said, that one element in it is the understood law that every brother must sacrifice something of his individual liberty, must offer something very important in the way of self-will on the altar of the common good. It seems hard, for instance, to surrender some of our rights as citizens: but it has always been found necessary. The surrender in question—that of the private right to agitate for the disendowment of the Church of England—may seem a heavy requirement. But it has been long found by experience that it is a necessary one. Not because the sentiment of Methodism is so strongly in favour of a national establishment. It was so formerly, but is so no longer. The majority would probably join the very large minority in the Church of England itself in preferring to see the union between Church and State dissolved. But that is not the point. The permission to take a side, one way or the other, on a subject of such fundamental importance would introduce an element of discord at once. This is the

religious reason for the anxiety of the Conference to keep its members aloof from this burning question. On other points of deep social and political interest it is not so fastidious. It has its Committee of Privileges to watch public affairs narrowly; and is not curious to watch the conduct of its members. But on this question there is a rooted conviction that abstinence is vital.

We must look, however, at another view of it. The ancient, time-honoured, and well-understood relation of the Methodist societies to the ecclesiastical bodies in the midst of which they are planted has been that of strict neutrality, so far as they are in conflict with each other, and of eclectic combination of all the good points among them so far as they merely differ from each other. That is, in plainer terms, Methodism has never joined Dissent as against the Church, nor the Church as against Dissent. And, observing this attitude of peace, it has continued to maintain what it has had from the beginning very much in common with both. We think, and cannot help taking this opportunity of once more expressing the conviction, that the mission of this community, so far as concerns Great Britain especially, is very much bound up with its fidelity to this twofold principle.

The fact which underlies the latter of them—the eclectic character of Methodism—is not generally estimated at its full measure of importance. There are many who are not prepared to hear that the Methodist economy retains as much of the Anglican as of the Puritan element, and as much of the Puritan as of the Anglican. But it is the fact, nevertheless. Though the Articles of the Church of England have never been formally accepted as the standard of Methodist doctrine, they have never been formally repudiated. An unhappy abridgment of them, in fact, is to be found in the Service Book formerly used. Certainly the Articles—with certain inconsiderable changes and omissions—might at any time be adopted as the more public declaration of the tenets of the body. Though this could not be said of the Westminster Confession, or any other existing formulary, with the same measure of truth, it is not to be doubted that the doctrine taught in all Methodist pulpits is—save the Calvinistic chain—very much what is preached by the other Nonconformist bodies of the empire; in fact, more like what they preach than what is preached in the Establishment. The best divinity of the Anglican

Church and of the Puritans is equally precious to Methodist divines; both enter almost equally into the preparatory studies of the young ministers of the Body. And, generally speaking, there is a very happy combination in the Connexion of the best elements both of Church and of Dissent: a combination that may not be so apparent now, perhaps not so much valued now, as when this generation began, but, nevertheless, a combination that furnishes the key to the best part of the secret of the history of Methodism.

To those who object and ask if, then, the system of Methodism is only an eclectic composite of fragments of other ecclesiastical systems, without any originality in its substance and form, we have a ready answer. The resultant, or *tertium quid*, is something very different from either and from both: how much better or how much worse is not now the question. It is so different from those which have contributed to it as to be very much like a new creation. Yet not so new as to imperil its unity with the Christendom of all ages; not so new as to be a thing without lineage and without precedent. Taking it altogether in doctrine, and discipline, and general spirit it is as catholic a system as any at present extant, while it is as rigid and bigoted—where bigotry is a virtue—as any of the strictest sects in Christendom. The word eclectic is not a fortunate one to express its catholicity. The fragments it has incorporated from other systems are very slight in comparison with the great bulk of truth which it has received and retained as its heritage in general Christianity.

And how does all this bear on the question we are considering? Methodism is at present a refuge to many who are driven from the congregations of the National Church: in many cases the only possible refuge. There are many in every part of the land,—not only in the great cities but in the rural districts also,—who are repelled by Ritualism; some who are repelled by Latitudinarianism; some, though not so many, who are repelled by Calvinism of the more intense kind; who are not prepared to go the full length of escaping into the regions of what is commonly called Dissent, but would be most thankful—are in many instances most thankful—to make the easier transition into the congenial services of Methodism. Where Methodism is most faithful to its earlier traditions they are amazed to find how much they retain of what they are loth to give up, how little they are obliged to renounce of what they have been

educated to respect, and with how slight a shock they can make the exchange. Such persons are to be numbered by thousands, and the number would be much larger if there were found everywhere a Methodist chapel with the Liturgy and the Communion Service. We believe that it would be sound policy—speaking on behalf of the Methodist community and using the word policy in the most Christian sense that it will allow—to have a chapel in every city and town with the full Morning Service: that is to say, in those districts where the general feeling is against the Liturgy, there should be one place at least where it might be found. Unless we very much mistake, that chapel would never be more thinly attended than its neighbours.

If this mere suggestion were a serious proposition there would be, of course, a strong outcry against it. The simplicity of some would cry out against the carnal policy or worldly compromise of such a plan; and in answer we should plead St. Paul's example, who became all things to all men that he might gain some: without any irreverence we should claim to be neither better nor worse than he. Others would raise a vehement clamour in defence of the nobility of thoroughness and straightforwardness and decision; they would say that the Connexion has been already too long halting between two opinions and compromising its dignity. To these we should reply that what constitutes, and has always constituted, and will always constitute, the peculiar value of the Society is the very circumstance that it occupies this midway position. Others, finally, would deprecate the thought of increasing the use of the Liturgy by one single instance, or of retaining any conformity to the usages of the Church by a single hour: that is, they would plead their honest convictions as to the evil of that kind of worship. In their case we should have to argue the question of the value of the Liturgy as amended by their own appointed Revision Committee; and beg them to consider whether they are not bound to make a concession for the advantage of others in a case which would not involve them in any danger or harm.

To return, however, from this digression to our review of the proceedings of the Conference on these questions, we would state in conclusion our confidence that the ancient, traditional, and as it were sanctified rule will not be reversed; that of maintaining an attitude of strict neutrality as between the old Anglican Church and the communities which make



part of their vocation to assail it as it is the National Church. It is beginning to be generally understood and acknowledged that the soundest policy as well as the most obvious fairness point in that direction. On this latter point much might be said with reference to the claims of those members of the Methodist ministry and laity who retain their respect for what may be called the Mother Church. It may be said of very many of them that they gave their early pledges to Methodism when it was friendly to the Church of England as the national expression, however faulty, of a principle that they are not ashamed to avow, that the nation should honour and sanction the Christian faith; that they have always cherished a kindly feeling, fed by innumerable sources of historical association, from the common Reformation down to the Methodist Fathers, for the old Church; that they believe themselves to be only faithful to the old traditions, and to the spirit of the Founder bequeathed and recommended; that they do not feel called upon by anything that occurs to change their sentiments, believing that clerical intolerance will work its own cure. They plead for at least forbearance on the part of their brethren more advanced. They think they have a right to much more than forbearance: indeed, to have their sentiments respected and dealt with accordingly. But this is enough for the present.

The relation of Methodism as a Society to the other Christian Societies of Great Britain cannot be even briefly glanced at without noticing the old question of the position of the communicants who are not, strictly speaking, members of the Society: Nothing can be more obvious than that it is the duty of the Connexion to honour, and equally to honour, the conditions of its Society membership and of its Church membership. When we say "equally" to honour, of course our meaning is not that the terms of membership in the Society are as sacred as the terms of membership in the Church. We mean that it is bound to respect both, and to make both harmonise, and work harmoniously. This has always been done, although not so avowedly as some would desire. Never has the position and standing of a baptized person been dishonoured by either the Methodist constitution or its administration. Never has the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper been denied to a single soul because the ticket of membership in the Class was not produced. Methodism has nothing to fear from any Scrip-

tural theory of the sacramental badges of Christian membership. But it is bound, by its ancient charter and according to the will of the Spirit, to maintain inviolate its condition of Society membership. This, we gather, has been unanimously and very strongly asserted of late throughout the Connexion.

But many are asking the question: What is precisely the condition of Society membership? The answers will, as we think, converge finally towards such an interpretation of the Class fellowship as will include all godly persons who place themselves under the supervision of the pastorate, and are willing to undergo the ordeal and be subject to the discipline that those are under who meet weekly in class. Such persons will never constitute a large section, if these restrictions are observed. They would be members of the Society; inasmuch as their names would be enrolled in books in the hands of the ministers, and those ministers would be to all intents and purposes their leaders, and through those books and their ministers they would sustain to the leader's meeting and Society generally precisely the same relation that other members sustain. Thus, in fact, the Methodist Churches and the Methodist Societies would be virtually and really one. For the system is free enough—as it ought to be—to admit as before to the Lord's Table exceptional cases on the right conditions. Of course, there would be some danger in such a course: the danger, namely, that many would seek this easier method of conforming to Methodist requirement. This ought not, however, to be much urged, in the presence of the fact that so many are even now admitted to all the privileges of the Body on such easy terms. Moreover, it need not be an easier method. The minister, pastor, bishop, overseer of every flock would see to it that his communicants were watched over rigorously; and in many cases, doubtless, he would be successful in inducing them to become members of other classes, or members of his own class with the recognition of the privilege of weekly meeting for Christian communion.

We are only, however, expressing what has been more than once during the last ten years expressed in this journal. The matter is not one of the topics of special interest just now; though a special interest in one sense it cannot fail always to have, while so many of the best lovers of Methodism are unhappily unable or indisposed to find leaders

under whose charge to place themselves. We drop the subject with the expression of our satisfaction at the strong determination of the Connexion to do the very utmost to keep alive the institution of classes, to seek by all means to raise the standard of the leadership, and to maintain unimpaired the class-meeting as one of the most efficient means of grace, and one of the most valuable aids to pastoral oversight and discipline. These are not days when Christian communities can afford to relax any of their disciplinary regulations. The tendency is already too much in the other direction. One good result of the tenacity of the Methodist people in holding to their old institute of weekly meetings for spiritual supervision will be that they will thus utter their protest against the Latitudinarianism that is disposed to dispense with all tests of doctrine and of life, and to admit to the sacred sealing ordinances of the Christian Church all who simply desire to come.

We now turn to the last of the three aspects of the Connexional unity, as expressed in the Conference: the oneness of the body of ministers as a brotherhood of servants of Christ who are not only members of a common ministerial order but also Brethren of a Common Lot as separated for the spread of the Gospel.

Something has been already said as to the peculiar and undefinable bond that unites this brotherhood. Little needs to be added on this subject so far as concerns the union of the body of ministers as they are men, and the dangers to which their unity is exposed. There always has been, there is now, and there always will be, something like secret history on this subject into which we will not intrude. So far as it does transpire it is highly honourable to this brotherhood. It is found that the sound Christian feeling, the principle of honour, and the common understanding, are guardians to which may be safely committed the preservation of unity. Generally speaking each member may feel himself tolerably safe under this protection. There may have been individuals found who have let their private theories, their party spirit, their restiveness under the yoke of authority, their ambition to be distinguished, or their love of change, prevail against their good sense and hurry them into personal attacks masked and unworthy. But these secret sowers of discord belong to the past. They do not seem to exist now. Anonymous writers may occasionally fall into error, and slip unconsciously or undesignedly

into a style of personality which if continued would be fatal to peace. But there is very little reason to dread this element of danger. The experience of the past is sufficient warning. Unless we mistake very much, the common, unanimous and most hearty condemnation of the Conference, of any Conference that might or could assemble, would effectually suppress the faintest attempt to disturb the peace by secret agitation. Whatever is done must be done publicly. And whatever is done publicly will in the main be honourably and in the end peacefully done.

It is pleasant to turn from such a subject as this to another of more importance. How is it with the Conference as to the one great object for which the preachers were originally raised up before they became pastors, when they were evangelists going up and down the land with a message almost forgotten among men. During the last year there have been revival services of various kinds, conducted by many Churches, and on a wide variety of principles; the chief and most influential having been those which have been under the guidance of earnest men from America. The Conference did not break up without the expression of its frank and grateful acknowledgment of the Divine presence and power in these evangelistic services; and of its earnest hope that its own manifold agencies may feel the good effect of the stimulant thus communicated.

There is good reason to think that the lessons taught by the evangelists will not be without a tone of admonition and even humiliation. The Conference literally had no time to converse at length on the subject. This is much to be lamented. The thorough sifting of this matter, in the fear of God, and in the simplicity of common desire to do the best for the cause of religion, would have been very useful: perhaps the reports of the addresses which would probably have been delivered, viewing the question from all sides, would have been more useful than most of the discussions the records of which crowded the papers. A fair and dispassionate consideration of the subject must have led to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit has been teaching the churches of Great Britain a humbling lesson. Or, rather, that He has been exciting them to more earnestness and stirring them up to emulation by giving His sovereign approval to agencies which in their estimation might have seemed other than the most approved. We may admit this without echoing the extravagant sentiments which we find

in certain American papers : which indeed represent the two Revivalists as having come across the Atlantic to arouse the British churches from a state of profound lethargy if not slumber and sleep. We can smile at this, in the midst of our due self-depreciation. A good, steady, earnest and effective evangelistic work has been going on for years in these islands, without the preliminary work of which the appeals of these men of God would have been comparatively in vain.

Our present subject requires us to limit ourselves to the work of the Methodist preachers. They are generally supposed—including all the various subdivisions of them—to represent the evangelistic and revivalist element among the forces of British Christendom : to represent, that is, in the sense of taking the lead, as the first among equals. At any rate this used to be their distinction : given to them by those who sometimes valued the distinction very slightly as well as by those who esteemed it very highly. We have seen remarks—made by writers in English periodicals and in American, and indeed in Continental also—which seem to imply that something in the style of the American revivalists, and in the character of their work, tends to show that the days of the old Methodist revivals are over. Certainly there is a great difference between the two orders of revival service. The comparison is not always in favour of the Methodist, especially of that form of it which is represented by some of the more modern bodies of Methodists. But we still believe that the mission of this people has not yet been fulfilled ; that their commission abides uncanceled ; and that their work in the evangelisation of Great Britain has only begun. Lessons of great importance they needed to be taught, and still need : a more simple dependence upon the truth and the accompaniment of the Divine Spirit ; a more realising apprehension of the special promises given to the Christian ministry ; a stronger faith in the “ preparations of the heart in man,” in man generally, and especially in man as living amidst Christian influences ; and, above all, the necessity of a purer and more perfect consecration to the one service of the one Master. All this they required to learn more effectually, in common with all other preaching communities. And, as their own particular lesson, it may be that the Spirit has been teaching them the importance of being more careful in distinguishing between the mere effects of excitement and the permanent results of a visitation of the Holy Ghost.

If their lessons are well learned, we are confident that the Methodist Body will be yet the leading evangelistic power in the empire. It will have that prerogative, whatever else it has or has not. It will never be very heartily recognised by the denominations around. The Anglican Church will continue to repel it, and all the more determinately and rigorously because it approximates so closely in many things; precisely as that Anglican Church is bitterly and contemptuously repelled by Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism again by the still older Oriental and Orthodox Church. It will still be regarded with suspicion by the other Nonconformist bodies, partly because of its uncompromising Arminianism and partly because of its imputed policy of temporising and sympathy with the Establishment. It will still be regarded by many, in England and on the Continent, as empirical in its learning and dogmatics. But we venture to think, and to prophesy, that it will still be the leading power for the spread of the Gospel in this land: combining as no other community combines the doctrine that is adapted to successful evangelisation, and the organisation that is adapted to make it successful. The tone of these remarks may seem too sanguine. It might be justified on other grounds; but it may not be inappropriate to dwell on these two points a little longer.

The system of doctrine preached by the body of ministers in connexion with the Conference is specially, by the admission of all men, that which is most favourable for use in dealing with sinners. It is essentially a doctrine of universal redemption, universal salvability, universal offer of mercy on the part of God, and universal preparation to receive it wrought among men by the Holy Spirit; and it knows nothing of any restrictions in the conditions of this catholic and free Gospel, such as fetter many of those who also maintain the universality of the provisions of grace. The far larger part of those whose theology admits all mankind into the sphere of the operation of Divine grace hold also a high sacramental theory, which goes far to bind again what had been made free. How can a preacher proclaim with all his soul a sufficient and a present salvation to miscellaneous multitudes, many of whom have not been baptized into preliminary grace, which on his theory is essential to the power of receiving it? If he assumes that his hearers have been baptized and made regenerate,



he must preach to them as having lost baptismal grace, and, therefore, as requiring a discipline of penitence and restoration, which is difficult and elaborate precisely in proportion to the consistency of the preacher's sacramental theory. We have heard much of the extraordinary power of certain Ritualist Revivalists; and, in common with all who have heard of it, we have greatly rejoiced. But if these preachers are true to their theology and theory, they must cumber the process of a sinner's return to God with many difficulties which Scripture does not place in his way: the main difficulty being that of recovering a grace which, once lost, is only by special intervention restored. The ancient sacramental theory—that which was matured in the middle ages—made ample provision, in its own way, for this emergency. It admitted, and still admits, the delinquent to the benefit of penance, as the Divine appointment for retrieving the lost privilege of baptismal acceptance. If our Ritualists, so called, adopt that system of dealing with souls—and many of them avowedly do—then they cease to be Protestant preachers: what is more, they cease to be evangelical, and they fall out of the range of any comparison with others. Their revivalist preaching is adapted only for a certain peculiar class of the people; they are not preachers for the masses. They may be, and we are told that they are, among the first revivalists of the day: in fact, the assertion is sometimes made that they have succeeded to the old prerogative of the Methodists, and entered into a vocation which these have forfeited. The remark will be more to the point when these preachers shall have been brought by their burning zeal to a purer and clearer view of the Gospel of Grace: that is, when they shall have passed through the phases which the earliest Methodist preachers passed through, from the highest Ritualism to the genuine simplicity of the Gospel call.

There is another class of eminent preachers to the unconverted, whose peculiarity is that they are bound to a doctrine which limits the virtue of the atonement to the elect beneficiaries of Divine sovereign grace, while they are free as the Redeemer and His Apostles were in announcing salvation to every creature. We have no thought of satire or condemnation in referring to them. Nothing can resolve away the fact that some of the mightiest and most successful revivalists have been men of the strictest sect of



the Predestinarians; nor can we be blind to the evidence given in these very times that a remarkable movement upon the masses of the people is conducted by men who, at least, use the co-operation of Calvinists. Still, the truth remains that there is, and must be, in the minds of those who preach to thousands upon thousands a present and unlimited salvation, the secret reservation that God must select from among the masses His own; and that secret reservation must, in some way or other, tell unfavourably upon the end of the preacher's mission. At any rate, *ceteris paribus*, they must needs be at a great advantage who preach without any such restriction.

Again, the Methodist system, besides being adapted to bear on the general society of the land as a revivalist power, is so constructed as to afford the best facilities for consolidating and securing the results of preaching. No other system is comparable to it in this respect. Others may rival it in preaching; others may surpass it in actual present success; but none come near it in the provision it makes for gathering in and saving the results. Here ministerial and lay agency most remarkably combine. The home provided in the class-meetings, the systematic organisation of its workers in every department, the encouragement it gives to the zeal of new converts, all conspire to place modern Methodism at the head of all institutes for marshalling the fruits of a revival. This has always been one of its characteristics. It is not pleasant to make comparisons which seem to disparage others. But the pre-eminence we have mentioned is shown in a most marked way by comparing the steady work of this system, week after week and year after year gathering under ministerial care and instruction in the society, with the irregular and occasional influence of the greatest revivalists upon thousands who are subjected to a swift test and inquiry for an hour after their pious determinations have been formed, and then know no more of their teachers and guides.

It is common enough to hear disparaging observations as to the spirit of modern Methodism. It is often compared with older and better days, when great revivals were of constant occurrence, and the preachers were a mighty power in the land. The simple answer to all this is furnished by a candid perusal of the documents or annals of those older and better days. They show the same

variations; the same ebbs and flows of the tide of religious influence; the same seasons of dense apathy following on seasons of vehement earnestness; the same connection between ardent and pure zeal and the diffusion of an unction of grace: in fact, the signs and proofs that in this great matter the Spirit of God, who dispenses His gifts according to His own will, puts forth His power according to general laws which have much to do with human conditions.

As proof that the old times were not in this matter much better than our own, we may quote Mr. Wesley's account of the Conference of 1775; it will be a fair counterpart or foil to the Conference of 1875:—

"Tuesday, August 1.—Our Conference began. Having received several letters, intimating that many of the preachers were utterly unqualified for the work, having neither grace nor gifts sufficient for it, I determined to examine this weighty charge with all humble exactness. In order to this, I read those letters to all the Conference; and begged that everyone would fully propose and enforce whatever objection he had to anyone. The objections proposed were considered at large; in two or three difficult cases, committees were appointed for that purpose. In consequence of this, we were all fully convinced that the charge advanced was without foundation; that God had really sent those labourers into His vineyard, and had qualified them for the work. And we were all more closely united together than we have been for many years."

This record, being interpreted by other passages, and read in the light of other signs of the times, will show how anxiously a hundred years ago the spiritual efficiency of the Methodist ministry was tested and watched. We quote the above, of course, for the sake of the centenary parallel; but every student of the *Journals* of John Wesley and of his minor controversial works, will be able to bear witness that almost every complaint about modern Methodism—whether it respects its external or its internal relations—had its counterpart a hundred years ago.

Turning over a few pages of the *Journal*, we find the Conference of 1877 alluded to in the following terms:—

"Tuesday, 5.—Our yearly Conference began. I now particularly inquired (as that report had been spread far and wide) of every assailant, 'Have you reason to believe, from your own observation, that the Methodists are a fallen people? Is there a decay or an increase in the work of God where you have been?'

Are the societies in general more dead, or more alive to God, than they were some years ago?' The almost universal answer was, 'If we must "know them by their fruits," there is no decay in the work of God, among the people in general. The societies are not dead to God. They are as much alive as they have been for many years. And we look on this report as a mere device of Satan, to make our heads hang down.'

"But how can this be decided? 'You, and you, can judge no farther than you see. You cannot judge of one part by another; of the people of London, suppose, by those of Bristol. And none but myself has an opportunity of seeing them throughout the three kingdoms.

"But to come to a short issue. In most places the Methodists are still a poor, despised people, labouring under reproach, and many inconveniences; therefore, wherever the power of God is not, they decrease. By this, then, you may form a true judgment. Do the Methodists in general decrease in number? Then they decrease in grace, they are a fallen, or, at least, a falling people. But they do not decrease in number; they continually increase. Therefore, they are not a fallen people.

"The Conference concluded on Friday, as it began, in much love. But there was one jarring string. John Wilton told us he must withdraw from our Connexion, because he saw the Methodists were a fallen people. Some would have reasoned with him, but it was lost labour; so we let him go in peace."

This leads to a few observations on the spirit of the Methodist Conference from year to year, as it respects the cultivation of religion and the work of God within the flock, as distinguished from its work upon the masses outside.

A peculiar feature observable in some recent Conferences has been the gathering of ministers and people to what are called "Holiness Meetings." The large, and indeed, enthusiastic congregations which assemble on these occasions prove that they respond to a strong and deep feeling: to a wide-spread yearning for a higher blessedness in God and a mightier power in His service than are the general lot of Christians. Nothing can be said against these meetings: everything in their favour. They are very simple in their character; profess no new doctrine, but that which has been held from the beginning; and aim only at stirring up the minds of believers to a more vehement pursuit of practical godliness. Such meetings, however, being of comparatively recent date, and not included in the Conference programme, have encountered, of course, some

criticism: these are days in which everything, especially everything new, that forsakes the common track, has to give an account of itself.

These meetings are not only important as direct means of grace to those who attend them; they furnish an opportunity of exhibiting the Methodist views on the doctrine of Christian perfection at a time when those views need to be very clearly and fully set forth.

They help to keep alive the old-fashioned and sound conviction that the prosperity of the Methodist Society—we would fain say of the Christian Church—is bound up with the maintenance of a high standard on the subject: not only as to the degree of grace that is offered in the Christian covenant, but as to the importance of constantly urging upon believers the importance of seeking what used to be called a "full salvation." Just a hundred years ago this note occurs in Mr. Wesley's *Journal*: the date is Wed. 14 August, 1776: "I preached at Tiverton; and on Thursday went on to Launceston. Here I found the plain reason why the work of God had gained no ground in this circuit all the year. The Preachers had given up the Methodist testimony. Either they did not speak of Perfection at all (the peculiar doctrine committed to our trust) or they spoke of it only in general terms, without urging the believers to 'go on unto perfection,' and to expect it every moment. And wherever this is not earnestly done, the work of God does not prosper."

Apart from the "peculiar doctrine"—of which more anon—it must needs hold good that the great work a Christian people have to do in the evangelization of the land will be well and successfully done just in the proportion of their devotion to it. Much may be said about times and seasons of special visitation, and much about the special qualifications of certain men for the work of evangelists, and much about the necessity of adopting new expedients for meeting the case of those who are hardened against the old. But nothing on any of these points can be said that touches the question so closely as the importance of going with sanctified hearts to the work of the Christian mission. They must ever be the most useful preachers who are the holiest. Those who desire to promote a revival anywhere must begin with the church: the preparations must begin at the house of God. So far from gently censuring these meetings as irregular, their

opponents should themselves attend. Well would it be for the entire community if such assemblies of ministers could be oftener held, at different centres, for the express purpose of carrying out the idea of the Brighton Convention for the benefit of the cause of Methodism.

But the mention of the Brighton Convention suggests another reason why these gatherings are useful. They serve to keep prominent before the public the true doctrine—or what they hold to be the true doctrine—as to the Christian perfection which, according to John Wesley, was “committed to our trust.” There are variations and modifications of that doctrine current which are exceedingly like it on a superficial view, but exceedingly unlike it when carefully considered. Now the benefit of these periodical agitations of this question—if the term agitations may be allowed on so sacred a subject—is that attention is drawn to these dogmatic points of affinity and divergence: the issue being certainly in the long run a clearer apprehension of the Methodist doctrine itself. Already it may have been observed that our religious serials have been occupied with the subject; that essays of more or less value have been written; and that there are all the signs of a general and not unhealthy investigation of this doctrine and all that it involves.

The testimony to the completeness of the Spirit’s work of grace in the human soul, as an application of the atonement, has been and is still the leading peculiarity of Methodist teaching, that renders it most important to watch against the extension of changes in the statement and definition of the doctrine, and in the phraseology used from the beginning. The blessing of God on the meetings for the promotion of holiness held by Christians from America has tended to recommend new aspects of the truth and new phrases, and a new combination of phrases. It is not a defect of charity and simplicity to say that they ought to be closely examined. If this doctrine is, as Mr. Wesley said, a deposit, its trustees are bound to be exceedingly watchful. Not suspiciously watchful, as if they were the sole trustees. They would be utterly unfaithful to the trust if they did not desire, with all their heart, that every church in Christendom should hold the truth and preach it better and more successfully than themselves. But the obligation is as obvious as it is solemn to watch closely the terminology with which the people are

gradually made familiar; because the words which convey a doctrine exert a very great influence on the popular conception of the doctrine itself, and words which in one sphere and among one class of people have a clearly defined and conventionally sound meaning may not be so innocent of error when adopted in another sphere and by another class. We are only gathering up sentiments freely expressed in conversation and in the papers when we add that there is need of care to preserve faithfully the primitive Methodist doctrine as to the preparations, as to the critical attainment, and as to the results of entire sanctification. This is not the place for expansion of these points; but a few remarks may be made.

As to the first, a kind of phraseology ought to be avoided which tends to confound "sanctification" and "entire sanctification." For some time past there has been a tendency to drop the term "entire;" and to speak of sanctification, or, as it is sometimes called, purity, as a blessing totally distinct from acceptance, as, in fact, a "second blessing," the goal and consummation of the Christian life. This misuse, or undue extension of the word, is to be noted in many writers and speakers, whether American or English. It is to be accounted for by the very nature and, if we may so speak, by the very sanctity of the word. Its supreme use in relation to our Lord Himself—who could be sanctified and sent into the world though He could not be *entirely* sanctified, His sanctification being His mission and anointing—has helped this. "The Sanctified" is a phrase that seems to carry the highest meaning with it. This wider application among the Methodists, moreover, may be explained by the fact that in a large portion of Mr. Wesley's familiar writings the word "sanctified" is so used as to signify the finished work of the destruction of sin. That he observed the distinction, however, is obvious. When precision of language was needful, and in Conference conversation, we find him saying, "it is not proper to use it in that sense, without adding the word *wholly, entirely, or the like.*" But many of his people neglected the distinction; and much of the phraseology now current will help to continue the error: if indeed the term error is not too strong. The word, in fact, is one of the most extensive in the New Testament. It covers a wider range than any other. It joins justification as meaning the cleansing from guilt leuitically viewed: viewed,



that is, as preventing the Divine acceptance on the altar. In its interior and more ethical meaning it is used of the entire process, slow and gradual and sure, of being conformed to the image of the Son: and here it joins regeneration. But, while the process of sanctification is constantly alluded to, there is a certain error of perfection in it, when all parts of man's nature are sanctified and to the full extent of the removal of all sin. Then, if this be so, it is well to make a difference where the Holy Spirit makes one.

That this caution is not superfluous appears in the fact that by a perfectly opposite effect of the same error—that of confounding sanctification with entire sanctification—no difference is allowed between them. If Methodist doctrine had anything put into its special charge it was this very distinction: the term "*entire* sanctification" was scarcely ever before used to define and stamp a specific privilege of the Christian covenant. The best mystical writers of all ages had expatiated much on "perfect love," and also on "Christian purification;" but "*entire* sanctification" had never before been brought into its due prominence. Now there is a tendency in the prevalent teaching on both sides of the Atlantic to melt away the glorious doctrine of entire holiness into something that can hardly be distinguished from the full victory over sin which is a characteristic of regeneration. Unless we are mistaken this error has attracted notice in the examination of candidates. But we must suspend these observations, which are passing beyond their legitimate province.

All who earnestly desire the advancement of Christianity in the world, and especially those who have a special interest in the contribution which Methodism is humbly offering to this object, will on the whole rejoice in the signs afforded by the late Conference in Sheffield. From beginning to end there was a healthy glow and a true life in it. On the points to which we have especially referred there was special ground of encouragement: the unity of the body was not only preserved, it was shown in a very marked manner. There was clear indication that every question as between ministers and people will be peacefully settled. The relations of the Conference with other communities were at least as satisfactory as could be expected, perhaps more so; and, above all, the religious tone of the whole—from the official utterances, which were of a very high order, down to the common daily devotional routine—was of most hopeful omen.



## LITERARY NOTICES.

---

### I. ENGLISH AND FOREIGN THEOLOGY.

#### HAGENBACH.

*Karl Rudolf Hagenbach.* Von Rudolf Stähelin-Stockmayer. Basel, Schneider. 1875.

ANOTHER of the eminent band of German theologians with whose names and labours this generation of Englishmen has been familiar is gone to his rest. After well serving the century in the first days of which he was born, he departed in June, 1874. Professor Stähelin, his successor in the chair of Church History and Historical Theology, has given a graceful and popular sketch of him, in his diversified excellence, "as scholar and as citizen, as teacher and as poet. Hagenbach was pre-eminently a theologian, a minister not of science nor of the State, but of the Church. All the various sides of a manifold and perfect character were united in him as they are seldom united." Externally viewed his career had little that was remarkable; it gives the picture of a studious life which from early youth to old age moved on steadily and without any breaks; of a scene of labour which, with the exception of a few college years, was bounded by the walls of his native town. But the name of this recluse student became well-known and widely honoured; his writings have not only been read by hundreds of thousands in Germany, but have been translated into Dutch, Danish, English, and Hungarian. And it may be said that not many have been privileged with so wide a sphere of influence at home and abroad.

He began his studies in Bonn, where Lücke exerted much influence upon him; and completed them at Berlin, where Schleiermacher and Neander taught him and moulded his character. From 1823 to the end of his life he was Professor in the Theological Faculty at Basel. His books are well known to English scholars, though not as yet in their best editions. The chief work of his life, on which he spent forty years of deep and affectionate labour, was the *History of the Christian Church*, which he has expanded in its final form into seven large volumes. A

portion of this work has been translated in America, and reproduced in England. Those who are familiar with it, and especially those who know the original, will agree with us that it has an unspeakable charm of simplicity, learning, and tender Christian feeling. Dr. Stähelin says no more than the truth concerning it: "It is the noble expression, not only of his most comprehensive learning, but also of his gentle spirit, and of his clear and pious view of Christian life. It is an historical work which occupies a high position, even among many of the highest in the same kind, especially as a history of Protestantism and its relations to literature and culture. It is a work of edification in the widest and best sense of the term, which has been blest to the awakening in very many of a languishing Christian life; and in many a young man has kindled a desire for the ministerial office and a decision to enter upon it. Hagenbach has proved in it the truth of what he expressed in one of his earliest writings, that only the Christian can write Church history with perfect conviction, and sincerity, and feeling. Another work, which we regard as still more important, is his *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology*, containing a systematic view of all the branches of theological science, with reference to their arrangement and articulation, and the leading works in every department. A translation of this is promised, we understand, by our friends and benefactors, Messrs. Clark. We venture to think this will be one of the most useful among the many useful volumes which they have lately issued. The two volumes in Clark's Theological Library of his *History of Doctrines* are even now, after many years have brought forward many rivals, the best book on the subject in the English language. It has reached in the original a fifth edition. There is another book, published by Hagenbach, which is very valuable as a guide to the practical study of theology.

The two following verses give a fair idea of his character and of the spirit in which he encountered death. He wrote them on his last birthday in his diary, and we give them for our German readers:—

"Mach's mit mir, Herr, wie Dir's gefällt  
Soll scheiden ich aus dieser Welt,  
So löse selber Du das Band,  
Wie du's geknüpft mit zarter Hand.

"Nichts hält mich länger hier zurück,  
Nicht Ehrenpreis, nicht Erdenglück;  
Nur Eines acht' ich mir Gewinn,  
Dass hier wie dort Dein Kind ich bin."

## RITSCHL ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

*Die Christliche Vollkommenheit.* [Christian Perfection.] Ein Vortrag von Albrecht Ritschl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1875.

THE subject of this essay—Christian Perfection—is evidently before the Church of Christ with an emphasis and earnestness of appeal quite unusual. It would be most interesting to investigate the reason of this, and ask how far it is merely matter of the cyclical revolution of important topics and how far it is due to the influence of the Spirit of holiness poured out on the minds of believing men and drawing them to a clearer view of their Christian privileges. The lecturer before us is by this time known to many of our readers as a free critic of Evangelical doctrine who has written a valuable work on the Atonement, the historical part of which, at least, is of great value. To find him lecturing on Christian Perfection is something remarkable.

How much he himself feels the peculiarity of his task will be evident from his opening words, which well state the question as it concerns the Lutheran Church especially:

“In opening the question of Christian Perfection I am well aware that I strike a note which sounds strange in the ears of evangelical Christians. We in the Lutheran Church are educated to such modesty or humility as to keep ourselves back from laying claim to any completeness in our attainments in the practical life. Our public doctrine goes particularly to the point that we never become so free from sinful impulse as to accomplish all the good works to which we are bound; that we in this department always remain behind our obligation; that we always fulfil only in part the demands of the love of our neighbour. If we compare with the moral law our actual good works we must always perceive, even in the best case, chasms in their connection and flaws in our own motives; thus for ever being precluded from asserting anything like perfection in our moral doings. But this, pursues such teaching, has the advantage that it prevents our being involved in self-righteousness, either generally or in comparison with God; giving us to expect our salvation from God alone, whose power and grace are only the more abundantly demonstrated when we are mindful of our weakness and imperfection. For even the ordinance of salvation through faith is so interpreted that, while perfection is appropriate to the Divine dispensation, the faith which we apply to it often is without the strength and confidence and joyfulness which belong to it. Thus who is there that can go beyond the cry of the poor man: Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief?

This is the evangelical traditional doctrine concerning the imperfection of our fulfilment of law and the imperfection which indwells in our saving faith. How can it be, then, but that the title of Christian Perfection which I prefix must be startling and disturbing and confusing?"

It might be supposed that our author is about to vindicate the power of Divine grace, as offered in the Gospel, to raise man out of the bondage of an inherited corruption, and enable him to exult in a conscious deliverance from sin; leaving him for ever the perfection of that humility which remembers the pardon of past guilt, and the dependence of the soul on God for power to think or speak or act aright. But this is not the line adopted by the lecturer. He goes off into an elaborate, and, to a great extent, incomprehensible, disquisition on the perfection which is based on the consciousness of being a complete integer in the creation of God. The theologian who should sketch the history of opinion on Christian Perfection would find some difficulty in locating this view of the subject.

To disarm prejudice against the doctrine the author suggests that the objectors to Christian Perfection may think that it is true humility to admit these necessary imperfections; in fact that any other course would be inconsistent with that. Hence there is a kind of religious element of perfection, and that of great importance, which requires this humility and must not be omitted in the definition. And it may be said that the formularies lay down the necessity of confessing imperfections only for that reason. Otherwise all would be repelled from the attempt. Now, it is undeniably a law of the exercise of the will that its power is weakened, and its zeal diminished, if the possibility of a perfect attainment of its object in any direction is denied by anticipation; or if the nearest possible approximation to the goal is regarded as of no greater and no less value than the remaining as far short as possible. Such an estimate would surely relax all energy in the pursuit: "Thus the idea of moral perfectness in action as well as in the formation of character is not simply necessary to establish our sense of imperfection: rather its value is this, that we steadfastly believe in our vocation to be perfect."

Now this law of the operation of our will is acknowledged and confirmed by the Founder of our religion and its most ancient teachers. Jesus describes love to enemies as a perfection which copies the perfection of God. According to St. James, patience under suffering has bound up with it a perfect wish "that ye may be perfect and complete." And St. Paul recognises perfect Christians, in whose fellowship he can speak the words of wisdom, as he tells the Corinthians. And still more plainly in the Epistle to the Philippians he declares that he had not yet reached the goal, and in that sense was not yet perfect, but that he pursued after it, for-

getting the things behind. And he speaks of "us who are perfect." Now Ritschl shows that the idea of perfection is not the same in all these passages. Our Lord marks a distinction between His people and the people outside. But the two Apostles refer to a difference between the imperfect and the perfect within the Church. And he dwells much upon the thought that the idea of the attainableness of some kind of perfection is regarded as present in the minds of all. He then proceeds to show that the Lutherans have erred in regard to this from the sad experience of history as to the distinction between perfect and imperfect Christians.

"This was the basis on which Monasticism was reared. But the rejection of this form of Christianity is so essential to the Reformation that the dread of everything that might tend to this supposed Christian perfection is in our very blood. What wonder if the very word so misused has become distasteful! Monks had its roots in pre-Christian religions; and the title of Christian Perfection was not adopted to describe it without having been changed according to non-Christian standards. . . . James declares that we must keep ourselves unspotted from the world. This might be interpreted that we must retire as much as possible from intercourse with the world; and especially shun the three spheres of special temptation: commerce of the sexes, the pursuit of property, and the endeavour after personal honour. Corresponding with these were the three monkish obligations: the rules of abstinence from marriage and family life, from personal possession, and from that independence which belongs to every adult man, substituting for this last an obedience to superiors, the violation of which was mortal sin. In these duties of chastity, poverty, and obedience was seen the supernatural or angelic life, in which the problem of Christianity was perfectly solved. But this involved the admission that not all Christians could be admitted into the cloister. What remained then but that the great majority of Christians should, in an imperfect life, experiment how by aid of the sacraments they might advance with the worldly life. The entire theory of the Romanist Church rests upon this distinction of perfect and imperfect Christians; so that the former might be distinguished from the latter by dress and dwelling. Monasticism, however, might shut itself out from the externalities of human life; yet the world and its temptations would force their way through the walls of the cloister and into the secret services of religion. History attests that after a while the discipline of the cloister declines, and that the removal from the regular intercourse of human life and avoidance of its tempting influence, led only to barrenness of mind and enfeebling of the moral character. For the life of the family, the pursuit of property, and the undisturbed enjoyment of personal honour are not

necessarily occasions of sin, but the indispensable conditions and impulses of the moral life. For the family is the school of the social feeling; property and honour are the props of independence, without which men can contribute nothing to the common good. There may be men very peculiarly constituted who remain inwardly true and good without these conditions of life, and under the restraints of the cloister. Generally, however, men in the monastic seclusion are not more perfect than they might have been in the world, but more imperfect."

Here we will translate a few more of the lecturer's sentences:—"How, then, may these claims to a Christian perfection be contradicted? Are we to suppose that it is enough to lay down the proposition that even in Christianity we can never go beyond imperfection? Such a mere negation, though involving the highest truth, is never enough to overturn a positive prejudice. We cannot war successfully by negatives; victory over error is won only by the assertion of a truth opposed to the error. Hence the Reformers were led to admit the title of Christian Perfection; but they were under the necessity of giving it another meaning, in order to invalidate the distinction it made among Christian people. They stamped upon the notion a character which would make it appropriate to all Christians; thus bringing the idea of Christian perfection back from the perversion of St. Paul's words to the line which our Lord's utterance prescribes. Accordingly we find in the Augsburg Confession: 'Christian perfection consists in reverence before God and the confidence grounded on Christ that God is merciful to us; in prayer to God; in the sure expectation of His help in all our undertakings in our vocation; in diligence unto all good works in the service of our calling. In these acts consists true perfection and the true service of God: not in celibacy, mendicancy, or in coarse garments.' To this I would add as supplement a word from Luther on monkish vows: 'The perfect estate consists in this, that with confident faith we condemn death and life, vainglory, and the whole world; and that in fervent love we seek to serve all men. But we can scarcely find men who more depend upon life and reputation, and are more empty of faith, who more violently shun death, than those who are most monkish.'"

Ritschl goes on then to group these clauses, in order to give us the Lutheran idea of that perfection which is the problem of every man's life: this sober idea is that of an attainment common to all; there are classes no more, but if there is a difference it is only that one is nearer the goal than another. Now this is a perfection which, he thinks, is adapted to man's nature, which is limited and always developing or becoming, and in this sense never like God: though still comparable with that perfection in God which appears in His great goodness towards the righteous and the unrighteous.

The reverence and trust in God of the Augsburg Confession he combines as *humility*; the expectation of Divine help and the contempt of death and the world he calls *faith and resignation to Divine providence*; then he adds the *supplication and thanksgiving of prayer*; and, finally, *fidelity in the relative duties of the vocation of life*.

He goes on to say that perfection as prescribed and asserted by our Lord, and St. James and St. Paul, has this meaning, that Christians, in their religious faith and moral conduct, should be or become *each in his kind a whole*. What that means it is hard to discover; but some light may be thrown on it by the sentence: "this gives the answer to the question proposed by all preceding religions, or rather saves from the contradiction which the natural man is involved in, the finding himself only a mere fragment of the world, while as spirit he is the image of God, and as such has a different value from all nature, with which, however, he has this in common, that he belongs to the universe." This very subtle view of Christian perfection is the highest that modern philosophic Christianity seems to be able to attain. This striving after his own completeness, through fellowship with God, is regarded as an expression of man's sense of need; his miserable feeling of being only a part of the phenomenal universe needs this to make him a complete whole to himself. "But the notion of the one complete universe is clear and comprehensible only in the Christian view of it. This is effected, however, not only by faith in the spiritual and almighty God, separate from nature; but also by the estimate put by Jesus on human nature, that the life of an individual man has a higher value than the whole world, and that this truth is maintained in life conducted after the Christian form." According to this notion, Christian perfection is the realisation of the perfect idea of man's value as independent of the visible universe. But it is evident that this is a very different idea from that which the New Testament sets before us. It is one also that we cannot square with the fact that Christianity regards every man as being a perfect whole, distinct from nature, whatever his religious character may be. The above theory simply makes perfection the perfect consciousness and estimate of the soul's value.

Our lecturer then descends to the specific Christian forms that perfection assumes in the New Testament. First comes fidelity in the moral vocation, which is to be clearly distinguished from fidelity to the universal law of morality. The help of God in the discharge of the duties of our ordinary vocation implies the possibility of a perfect discharge. As to the others, humility and faith and resignation to Divine providence, we have some very interesting notices, but all tend to show that the philosophic idea of perfection is something very different from that of the New Testament. The utmost Ritschl can say of them is that



they are "the various reflections of the religious assurance of our reconciliation with God through Christ." All that we can gather worth presenting is a small cluster of pithy and important sentences: "Natural religion is a delusion. There is only positive religion, and what theologians call natural religion consists always in testimonies of an altogether positive origin to which men have become accustomed, and the origin of which they have forgotten." "Humility as a religious virtue may be called the sentiment of dependence on God. Its web, however, is so delicate that it threatens to break if it is made an object, and it is sought to establish it by reflection. Humility, says Christian Scriver, is like the eye which sees everything but itself. So it is with patience. Patience is directed towards the world, as humility towards God; but they belong together, because every religion establishes a relation to the world which corresponds with the relation to God. Patience, however, expresses the fact that, in humble resignation to the guidance of God, "man obtains his freedom from the world, his superiority to its restrictions and demands generally."

We are disappointed in this essay, from which we expected much that would be piquant and valuable. The upshot of all, as here exhibited, is—First, that the Perfection of Rome, according to the "Counsels of Perfection," is not Christian; secondly, that Christianity establishes a Christian integrity and completeness of individual life which Pantheism knows nothing about; and, thirdly, that the ordinary life of piety, humility, resignation, and faithful discharge of the duties of the vocation, constitute the only Christian Perfection. The tractate tends to show how much the higher theological intellect of Germany needs enlightenment on this great question.

#### REUSS ON THE PSALMS.

*Le Psautier, ou le livre de Cantiques de la Synagogue.*  
1<sup>re</sup> and 2<sup>me</sup> Section de la V. Partie de l'ancien Testament de la Bible. Traduction Nouvelle, avec Introductions et Commentaires. Par Edouard Reuss, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1875.

Nor long since we introduced the first instalment of this new translation of the French Bible, with Introductions and Commentaries; which, as the work of one man, and of one whose labours are abundant in many other directions, is to be classed among the most remarkable phenomena of the day. Most heartily do we wish that this good Hebraist, learned theologian, and man of consummate taste, was also an humble believer in the integrity and authority of the volume of Scrip-

ture. But it is not so. His theory is almost as free as it can be.

This volume on the Psalms and Lamentations has, nevertheless, given us much interest; that portion of it, namely, which we have been able to read—the Introduction and a few of the Psalms. Some extracts we shall make and comment upon:—

“Among the Hebrews, as among all nations which have produced a literature, poetry preceded prose. Sentiments were born before ideas; and the desire to express them is, so to speak, imposed upon man long before he thinks of controlling them, or of co-ordinating his experiences. Man sings before he writes, unless education intervenes to invert the natural order; and there are races who have been arrested at the first of these stages, without ever arriving at the second. Among the Israelites we find poets from the earliest period of their history down to the time when the people, beginning to unlearn the language of their fathers, saw at the same time fade away the sources of their inspiration: that is to say, during a period of at least twelve centuries. At the outset we see it accustomed to the nomad life, not knowing and not enduring the curb of social law; without taste for labour, and satisfied to sit at the table of nature; loving combats, running after the prey, and seeking the guarantee of safety and enjoyment only in individual strength. By degrees the conditions change; an unexpected conquest introduces the necessity of field labour; this brings with it attachment to the natal soil, and, religious instruction aiding, there is formed a national sentiment, based on traditions at once poetical and sacred. This sentiment, constantly refreshed by repairing to its two sources, historical remembrances and a faith becoming more and more firm and pure, gave the Hebrew people, notwithstanding its numerical and material feebleness, such a consistency and vigour as could traverse all the vicissitudes of its political fortune, and ended by assuring to it existence at the time when the whole world was banded together for its destruction.”

We believe that the Hebrew nation, from its origin in Abraham to the time when it produced the Messiah and rejected Him, and ended the glory of its history thereby, was unlike every other nation in almost every respect. It was separate among all the peoples of the earth. Borrowing much and imparting much it retained its identity and distinctness. The national law referred to above does not hold good, and does not find its illustration in the ancient people of God. They did not begin with poetry and end with prose. Nothing could be more sternly and simply real and simple and prosaic than its earliest literature. But we must read on.

“Poetry was the faithful companion of the Israelite nation in all the phases of its history. Only we usually form a very im-

perfect idea of it, because we know it and judge it only by the little that remains to us. Everybody knows that the collection of various books which we designate by the name Old Testament, embraces all, absolutely all, the Hebrew literature anterior to the Christian era that has been preserved; a few books excepted belonging to the epoch of the Roman conquest, known to us only in translations. It is not right to have called this collection generally a library of the national literature of the Hebrews. Without doubt the books composing it made part of that literature; but they represent only one phase of it, only one kind. The collection of works and literary monuments which ended by becoming the sacred code of the nation, was formed for the purpose of religious instruction; and it is with that design that it was made to include, whether directly and without change, or after alterations and condensations, a certain number of books which, save for that, would have perished like many others. We shall elsewhere see how great these losses have been, and how much to be regretted, as they were historical documents."

Now M. Reuss is here at the threshold of one of the most wonderful revelations of the ways of God with man that history presents: the construction of the religious literature of the Hebrew race. But he has no heart for the subject in its grandeur. To him the Old-Testament Scriptures are simply what have been preserved of the literary productions of that people. That the amazing difference between that literature and every other is to be accounted for by the theory of an intervention of the Divine Spirit, selecting that language and its greatest writers to exhibit supernaturally the history of a kingdom of God upon earth, the confirmation of which was to be Christ and Christianity, he does not for a moment seem to admit. But, without dwelling farther on this, we must make another quotation.

"We have not yet spoken of another sphere in which poetry has played its part, that of religion and worship. There also, from the highest antiquity, song and dance, and concert of instruments, had their place by the side of sacrifice, around the altar built on a high place, or under the shadow of an old tree, or in the precincts of the sanctuary. Religious music and poetry were together taught to the young from the earliest times. In regard to this particular kind of poetry we are more fortunate than in regard to the others, as we have hinted already; although what remains to us does not precisely belong to the first ages of the national literature. We shall have to study the texts in detail. But we must at once come to an understanding as to the sense in which we may assert that Hebrew poetry, such as we know it, is essentially religious. In fact, all the pieces contained in the Old Testament do not enter into this category by the same title. In saying this, we have no need to mark particularly the

Song of Songs, for which we cannot assert a religious character, unless by the aid of a forced allegorical interpretation: for we are convinced that this book has obtained the honour of the place it occupies only by such a style of interpretation. We would rather speak of many pieces inserted among the historical books, which were not composed with a view to teaching; but in regard to which we feel sure that they were inspired by the religious sentiment, that they bear witness to the faith of their authors, and that they thus contributed to sustain and to fortify that of the people in general. We take then the word religious poetry in a sense rather wider than that which is generally given to it."

It was not simply that the poetry of the Hebrews was mainly used in the teaching of religion. It had no other purpose. Nor is it fair to say that what we possess are fragments collected from the general literature, most of which has perished. It may rather be asserted that the literature of the ancient Hebrews was sanctified from its origin to the testimony of Jesus. "They testify of Me." This does not literally mean that they testified of nothing else; but the fact simply is, that the service of God, the Messianic hope, and personal religion, were the three elements of the national literature never for a page forgotten. The whole is a profound and inexplicable enigma—a tremendous anomaly in ancient literature—unless we accept this Divine solution. It is still a mystery; but one that has been brought to light.

"The genius of the East in general, and more particularly that of the Hebrew people, has a very marked propensity to symbolism; that is to say, it experiences the need of clothing abstract ideas in forms which the imagination may seize, material forms we might venture to say, as if the intelligence of itself and alone were powerless to lift itself above the sphere accessible to sense. They are specially transcendent conceptions, such as the attributes of God, which take body and become as it were materialised, and that in a way which often offends our sentiment, inasmuch as it is still the animal world which is called upon to lend its forms to an order of ideas so absolutely different. We have only to remember the seraphim of Isaiah, the cherubim of Ezekiel, the serpent of Moses, and especially those figures of bulls, improperly termed golden calves, which constantly run throughout the entire course of the ancient history of Israel. From the same source flow the innumerable anthropomorphisms which arrest us at every step of our study of the original texts, and the naïve rudeness of which we find it hard to reconcile with the admirable expressions of religious sentiment, which they seem to degrade, until we remember the tendencies of a poetry unable to dispense with palpable forms. It is true that many of these anthropomorphisms have passed into the religious language of Christian nations; and we speak of the eye and of the hand of God without feeling our sentiment chilled, or our reason led astray."

M. Reuss proceeds then to explain how impossible it is to retain some of these figures; but to us he seems to waste labour on such a subject. Far better would it have been if he had shown how it came to pass that a religion which so strenuously and with such awful sanctions interdicted images and symbols of the Divine Being, yet kept before the minds of the worshippers a certain class of symbols which for ever tended to suggest a God incarnate. It seems pitiful that the sentences quoted above should be literally all that this Christian expositor has to say about the symbols of the Old Testament. To speak of the Oriental mind, and especially the Hebrew as delighting in images and symbols, is a very poor way of accounting for the glorious symbolical teachings of the Old Testament. But, so far as it goes, the observation of M. Reuss is correct; and the fact ought to be remembered in the interpretation, especially of the prophecies concerning the Messianic kingdom. There is a kind of exegesis which seems utterly to forget that the delineations of the kingdom and church of the Redeemer were given in Hebrew poetry for Hebrews; and that they must be translated into the prose of the Gospels and Epistles before they are incorporated into dogmatic theology. It pleased God to exhibit the future of His Son incarnate and the glories of His reign by symbols and figures, and descriptions of the utmost poetic affluence. When the Son came and without observation the faith of the people failed under the trial; and the punishment of their refusal to believe was that the very imagery they had perverted and abused became a snare to them. And not only in the days of the Messiah Himself, but in almost every subsequent age the same mistake has been committed. A gorgeous but most delusive Jewish phantasy has led the people astray. Jewish symbolical poetry entered into the canon of the New Testament. But the Apocalypse must be interpreted by the fourth gospel on the one side and the first epistle of St. John on the other.

M. Reuss concludes his elaborate introduction by a discussion of the date of the Hebrew Psalter. He enters on the question in a defiant spirit, as if conscious that he was about to outrage the feelings of many of his readers. His anticipatory deprecation contains a superfluous apology. Very many of those into whose hands this book will fall will be, of course, as ignorant as he expects them to be; but he might fairly have presumed on a large number of a somewhat more enlightened class. "For them," he says, speaking of us all, "the reply is given beforehand; David, king of Israel, was the author of the Book of Psalms." He affirms that uniform tradition has made this assertion. "Already in the first century, we see the authors of the New Testament citing passages of various psalms under the name of King David: not only of those which bear his name on their superscription, but of others which have come down anonymous, or under another name

than David's. What is more than that, the entire book bears the name of David." Surely Reuss is ingenuous enough to bethink himself that these facts are no evidence whatever that the writers of the New Testament were mistaken. It is impossible for him or anyone else to prove that the ancient keepers of the national documents were mistaken: in more than one of the instances quoted the argument is strongly against him, and the book might be called the Psalms of David without asserting that all its contents were of David's composition. But our critic condescends to such remarks as these: "This opinion has had so much weight even with the learned themselves that, knowing full well its incorrectness, they have not renounced the habit of using the king's name whatever passage they may have quoted; and our old Bibles with woodcuts do not fail to represent the author on the frontispiece, covered with his royal mantle, wearing his crown and playing on his harp."

We shall do M. Reuss the justice to give one of his psalms in his translation, and the accompanying notes, a fair specimen of his taste and skill. With this and a few remarks upon both the translation and the notes, we will conclude this brief notice of a very imposing but very unsatisfactory work:—

## PSALM II.

- "Pourquoi ce tumulte des peuples?  
Ces vains complots des nations?  
Les rois de la terre s'insurgent,  
Et les princes conspirent ensemble,  
Contre Jaheweh et son oint.  
'Allons briser leurs liens,  
Et jetons loin de nous leur chaînes!
- "Lui qui trône aux cieux se met à rier,  
Le Seigneur se moque d'eux.  
Puis dans sa colère il leur adresse la parole,  
Dans son courroux il les fait reculer d'effroi.  
'Et moi, j'ai établi mon roi,  
Sur Sion, ma sainte montagne!'
- "Je redirai le décret de Jaheweh.  
Il m'a dit: 'Tu es mon fils!  
C'est aujourd'hui que je t'ai donné le jour.  
Demande, et je te donnerai les nations pour héritage,  
Et pour domaine les extrémités de la terre.  
Tu les briseras avec ton sceptre de fer,  
Comme un vase d'argile tu les mettras en pièces!'
- "Or donc, rois, soyez prudents!  
Tenez-vous pour avertis, chefs de la terre!  
Soumettez-vous à Jaheweh avec crainte!  
Tremblez et frémissez!  
Armez-vous de loyauté, de peur qu'il ne s'irrite,  
Et que vous ne périssiez quand tantôt il s'emportera!  
Heureux ceux qui s'en tiennent à lui."

"This poem, which is distinguished by its highly dramatic vivacity, and by a strophic arrangement almost regular, is anonymous in the original, which proves that the Jewish *savants* had no tradition concerning its author, and that they did not venture to supply the chasm by a conjecture. According to all probabilities the author was a king, who lived in Jerusalem, perhaps recently enthroned, and finding himself confronted by an insurrection of neighbouring peoples, lately vassals of Israel, but purposing to throw off the yoke and take vengeance on their ancient masters. The Israelite king, confiding in the aid of his god, expresses the firm assurance that he will issue victorious from the conflict.

"What is most certain is, that the psalm was composed in view of a given and actual situation; and that nothing is more alien from the text than the explanation which sees in it the perspective of a distant and ideal future. . . . No Israelite king could have expressed himself thus. The geographical horizon was restrained, and the royal pride was in an inverse ratio to the power. But it will be impossible to determine either the epoch, or the person, to which these allusions might refer. Our knowledge of the history is too incomplete for that. . . . Suffice that the designation of the king as the Son of God is not unusual (Ps. viii. 2—6; lxxxix., 27, 28)."

The more clearly M. Reuss establishes his position that this psalm cannot be located in any particular period of Hebrew history, the more advantage does he give to the glorious old theory that makes the psalm the first of the Messianic predictions of the Hebrew muse.

Hence it is pitiful to read as follows, and to mark the sure signs of the gradual disappearance from the writer's mind of the faith that Jesus is the Sun, though as yet unrisen, of the Old Testament and especially of the Psalms. "We can understand that, at an epoch when all political allusions had vanished away, the Jews beheld in the King who here speaks the coming Messiah or King of the universal theocracy, and that their imagination took pleasure in the pictures of pagan peoples dashed to pieces as potter's vessels, and of strange kings bowing their heads under the yoke of the representative of Jehovah. They forgot that these kings and these peoples had not to *rise up* against a King who only appeared on the scene, nor to *break off* a yoke which had not been as yet imposed on them." We are at a loss to know what M. Reuss' idea is here. Those who rejoiced in the Messianic prospect evidently supposed that the King in Zion was to obtain a universal dominion through the subjugation of enemies, but not necessarily by deeds of physical violence. Our critic seems to have forgotten his own canons for the interpretation of Hebrew poetry; he seems to be as narrow in his



criticism here as prejudice can make him. But what follows is still worse. "Nevertheless, this interpretation interests us even in the present day, because the first Christians (Jews by origin and by education) appropriated it to themselves without being mindful of the evident contradiction between the spirit of the psalm and that of the Gospel (Luke ix. 55; Matt. xii. 20; xi. 29; xxi. 5)." It surely needs only a small amount of candour to confess that the symbolical victories of the angry Son of God are consistent with the perfect meekness of His character, as also that the peace and tranquillity of His reign, both within the hearts of His people and among the nations, are quite consistent with the demonstrations of His holy justice against those who persistently rebel. Such an argument as this would devote to incomprehensibility and confusion two-thirds of the Bible, which is the record of the dealings of a God who is at once tender and awful. Moreover, it would effectually shut the notion of a Personal God out of the universe; for the history of man, and the phenomena of creation, alike bear witness to the two classes of attributes if there be a God at all.

Then comes the vindication of M. Reuss's strange translation of the critical passage: "Kiss the Son!" "But what has mainly contributed to accredit, in Protestant schools, the Messianic interpretation is the circumstance that the Reformers were led astray by the authority of the Syriac version (recommended here by the Dominican S. Pagninus, the great oracle of the sixteenth century in the matter of Hebrew, who translates the commencement of the last verse by the words *Kiss the Son!* a translation philologically impossible, but maintained with tenacity by the traditional exegesis). In the Syriac *Bar* signifies *the Son*, in Hebrew *Ben* is always used, as is seen in our present Psalm, verse 7. The verb which precedes signifies in fact, *kiss*; but its first notion is to *attach oneself* to anything. Hence the Greek rendering, *adhere to instruction, apply to duty, &c.*; and the Vulgate, *accept instruction*. This suits the context very well. We have essayed another formula. The verb in question signifies also *to be armed, to arm oneself*; and the substantive derived from it is *armour* (Ps. lxxviii. 9; xlv. 8). Now, in Hebrew, we are said to clothe ourselves, or to gird ourselves, or to arm ourselves with a moral quality. The antithesis with armed rebellion is here quite in keeping, and *loyalty* is a rendering recommended by the dictionary. If it is necessary to hold fast the idea of *attaching*, we should prefer changing *bar* into *bo* (*to Him*), which in Hebrew orthography scarcely affects at all the tracing of the Hebrew characters."

Undoubtedly there has been a remarkable unanimity of error in the translation of this remarkable verse. The various renderings of the word translated "Son," would require a page for their

enumeration. But the Syriac was right. As Delitzsch says : "The context and the usage of the language require *osculamini filium*. The piel means to kiss, and never anything else . . . Nothing is more natural here, after Jahve has acknowledged His Anointed One as His Son, than that *Bar* (Prov. xxxi. 2, even *Beri* equivalent to *Beni*, *My Son*), which has nothing strange about it when found in solemn discourse, and here helps us over the dissonance of *Ben pen*—should in a like absolute manner to *chok*, *decree*, denote the unique Son, and in fact the Son of God. The exhortation to submit to Jahve is followed, as Aben-Ezra has observed, by the exhortation to do homage to Jahve's Son. To kiss, is equivalent to do homage. Samuel kisses Saul (1 Sam. x. 1), saying that thereby he does homage to him."

This psalm suggests its octave at the other end of the Psalter : Ps. cx. M. Reuss to our regret thus speaks :—

"We shall doubtless shock the feeling of many of our readers by declaring that it is impossible for us to adopt the traditional interpretation of this psalm, which may indeed be called the most famous of the whole collection. We are aware that it is reckoned in the first rank of the Psalms called Messianic, and that it is many times quoted as such in the New Testament itself. In fact, if it has David for its author, the personage whom the poet calls *his Lord*, and whom at the same time he distinguishes from Jehovah, should be some one greater than himself, and we are thus compelled to think of the Messiah. But we know that the inscriptions of the Psalms must be taken with much caution ; we must therefore examine the text itself to see if it justifies the title given to it. At the outset we are surprised to find a Psalm of David, so extraordinary and so important, relegated to the fifth book ; especially as the collector of the second book explicitly declared that there were no others "of his to be gleaned."

According to M. Reuss, the poet (unknown) glorifies a chief who, without being king, finds himself placed at the head of the Israelite nation in arms, and who had just gained a brilliant victory over the enemy ; moreover, this chief belongs to the sacerdotal caste, and nothing hinders us from calling him high priest or pontiff. But here we must call a halt. There is no ground for assuming that a great victory had been gained : rather the campaign was not yet begun. And what is there in Hebrew history to warrant our author in his calm supposition that the king was high priest also ? He is supposed to be compared, indeed, for want of other historical analogies to that ancient king of Salem whom the book of Genesis calls a "priest of the Most High God," a designation so remarkable in the case of a Canaanite that, in the eyes of posterity, it would not fail to eclipse even his royalty. Our hero is in fact a priest-king, without bearing officially the last title.

Enough has been quoted and said to show that not much is to be expected from this great undertaking. Whatever M. Reuss may accomplish for the historical books, it is obvious that he is without the true canons for the interpretation of the poetical parts of the Old Testament.

*D. L. Moody and his Work.* By Rev. W. H. Daniels, A.M., Chicago. With Portraits and Illustrations. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

THIS book is divided into two equal parts, the former being a history of Mr. Moody's early life and of his evangelistic labours previous to his recent visit to England; the latter portion is occupied with an account of that visit. Each part has its own interest, one as containing some account of one of the most remarkable series of religious services held in this country during the present century: the other as revealing the inner character, training, and manner of life of the principal agent in the whole.

The character of this now notable stranger is sufficiently singular to tempt an inspection and analysis, for which there is ample material in the sketch before us.

Dwight Lyman Moody was born amid the wild loveliness of Northfield, on one of the slopes of the Connecticut. He was thrown at a very early age, with several other young children, upon the care of a brave-hearted, loving, tender, but widowed mother, who struggled hard with poverty and toil under the shadow of sorrow and death. Spending his early days in scenes of external grandeur, "bold peaks, mountain torrents, and hurricanes sweeping over woods and hills," young Moody grew up a powerful, rough, unpolished son of the field, with a wild, free, untamed, exuberant nature, and earnest, impetuous spirit, wilful to the last degree, full of fun and ingenious mischief, capable of torrents of passion, but not insensible to many generous impulses, held in control by one, and only one—his tender, wise, and godly mother, to whom, but to none other, this strong, self-reliant spirit bowed.

Thus he grew up through his first seventeen years, his outward life one of hardy endurance, his inward spirit truthful and tender, but proud and wayward; firm in unflinching self-reliance, of which he gave many proofs, and dauntless as a young lion in presence of danger. Full to overflowing of laughter, frolic, and fun, he made little advance in sober studies. Thus he went forth into the world, leaving the free wild life of the mountains for commercial life in the city of Boston, his only piety his love of his mother and a sturdy determination to be an honest and successful man.

By the requirement of one on whom he was dependent, he

began to attend the Sunday-school, and the Mount Vernon Church, described as "one of the most excellent and exact of all the orthodox Congregational Churches of New England," in whose pastor, Dr. Kirk, "a prince among ministers," this strong, wild youth found "a man whom he believed to be wiser and stronger than himself, and he sat reverently at his feet and learned of him." A kind question from his Sunday-school teacher awakened his attention to the necessity for personal religion: he sought and found the assurance of the pardon of his sins and of his acceptance as a child of God. His consecration to the service of Christ partook of the same decisiveness and straightforward honesty that marked all his other conduct; and he threw the same restless enthusiasm and impetuous energy into his religious life that he did into all other matters. He soon found himself out of place in the settled and finished condition of things in Mount Vernon Church, and, striking out a new path for himself, he removed to Chicago, where a suitable field awaited him.

Here, zealous and tireless in working, equally in the store and in the church, he, after various rebuffs, settled down to the work of "a Sunday-school scout," the roughest and lowest of all Christian service, if that work be not indeed the highest which is truly a seeking in order to save the lost. "A Sunday-school scout" has a strange uncultured sound; but to hunt up "gutter snipes," to search for ragged children in the vilest dens of infamy and filth, to allure them to school, to win both their attention and their love, and to lead them to Christ in the fullest assurance of faith that by the Gospel of His grace they could be redeemed from their degradation, is a work which would ennoble any designation.

Projecting a more extended work he hired a deserted saloon in a vicious part of that vicious city, and opened a school. "The region in which this school was opened may be understood from the fact that, standing on the steps of the Old Market House near by, their voices could be heard in 200 drinking and gambling dens. It swarmed with young barbarians." A section of the town, called "The Sands," was to Chicago what St. Giles's is to London. "It was a moral lazaretto. Disorder, and even crime, was regarded as a matter of course on 'The Sands' which would have been checked and punished in any other part of the city. To this abandoned region flocked the bad women and worse men, who had fallen too low to feel at home anywhere else; and it was proverbially dangerous for any decent person to walk those streets after nightfall. Thither went Moody to recruit his Sunday-school."

Here begins an astounding record of Christian service in which all the vigorous qualities of this strong man were taxed to the utmost. The Sunday-school soon grew into a great mission, and

Moody gradually became "more and more a missionary and less and less a merchant, until, not suddenly, but by degrees, he came to be so full of religious work as to lose all interest in everything else." Under the influence of his unbounded zeal, the school, the mission, the noon-day prayer-meeting, and the Young Men's Christian Association (a branch of Christian service in which he has since shown the liveliest interest) all greatly prospered, and many of the churches of the city were quickened into more vigorous activity.

A new sphere of Christian toil opened to him when the war of 1861 broke out. A camp of rendezvous was established near Chicago. Moody and his companions saw and embraced their opportunity. The first tent erected was used as a place of prayer. A hundred and fifty ministers and laymen lent their aid. Every evening eight or ten meetings were held in the different camps; and an almost continual service within reach of every regiment on the Sabbath. "In these services Mr. Moody seemed almost ubiquitous; he would hasten from one barrack and camp to another, day and night, week-days and Sundays, praying, exhorting, conversing personally with the men about their souls, and revelling in the abundant work and swift success which the war had brought within his reach."

A call soon came from the field, in the interest of the sick and wounded. "Back and forth, between Chicago and the various camps and battle-fields, with tireless vigour and jubilant faith, Mr. Moody toiled and travelled, during the four terrible years of war. His frequent excursions to battle-fields and camps made him, more than any other man, the medium of communication between the work in the army and the work at home. He was on the field after the battles of Pittsburgh Landing, Shiloh and Murfreesboro', with the army at Cleveland and Chattanooga, and was one of the first to enter Richmond, where he ministered alike to friend and foe."

Mr. Moody was literally driven to organise into a church the large number of persons converted by his instrumentality: he was equally driven to become the pastor of his own flock. Whatever appearance of novelty or irregularity this might present to the eyes of ecclesiasticism, certain it is that it was done to secure the great ends of the church, in the reclaiming of the wicked and the promotion of godliness by means which they sought to keep in harmony with Scripture truth, and by those impulses which they believed were prompted by the Spirit of the Lord. If the Church was not there to do this great work, any imperfection in the work of them who sought to do it must be laid, in part at least, to the Church's account. Thus, in the homes of the wretched and sinful poor, in the school amongst little children, for whom he had the tender love of a woman, amongst earnest young men, amongst

rough servants of sin and brave suffering patriots, was this man of one purpose and one book trained for a work as singular as it was great, widespread, and marvellous.

"From Maine to Texas, from Montreal to San Francisco, from St. Paul to New Orleans, Mr. Moody went year after year, preaching and praying, rousing the Christian Association into activity, labouring with the pastors of churches in revivals; coming home now and then to give a few weeks' earnest labour to his own congregation, and finding a hatful of calls awaiting him. He thus gained experience of inestimable value, and received a training better than that of the schools, for the still greater work which the Lord had in store for him across the sea."

We have not space to tell of great labour and usefulness by means of Sunday-school conventions, "Bible-preaching and reading;" or of the new field for loving, Christian service cleared by the great Chicago fire with its great sorrows and losses, some insight into which may be gathered from the pages of this volume.

The latter part of the book opens with some account of Mr. Sankey's early life, and then follows a hurried record of the evangelistic tour begun in discouragement in York and gradually growing in interest and importance as it extended to Sunderland, Newcastle, and other towns in the North of England; to Edinburgh, Glasgow, and the North of Scotland; to Ireland, to Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, and Liverpool, until it culminated in what has been witnessed in the Metropolis during the past few months.

It is as impossible to estimate the amount of good wrought by the instrumentality of these strangers as it is to determine the proportionate influence of many forces operating to produce it. The preparation of Mr. Moody, and his special qualifications for the work of an evangelist, are very distinctly marked.

To the work of an evangelist he faithfully confined himself. He was not by profession either a pastor or a teacher. Around two foci his words revolved—sin, and the love of God. He wrought in the hearts of men a conviction of the consummate folly of their evil ways, and of the compassionate love that held out its entreaties and proffers of forgiveness. Beyond these limits his teaching did not widely travel, save when speaking to Christian people; then his one word was, work. He faithfully exalted the Word of God and exemplified the simplicity of prayer. On these subjects his teaching was clear as the light, simple as a child's song. His method was plain, direct, incisive; often tenderly pathetic, it was manly and straightforward, brave even to boldness; and the whole was suffused with a glowing but controlled earnestness. We feel little disposed to carp at a few



faults. That he was not cultured was no impediment to his acceptance with the multitude, to whom he spoke in their own language, while the tutored saw the truth shining too brightly amidst the rugged words to be fastidious. His illustrative anecdotes, vividly perceived and told with naturalness, were often very effective.

It would not be right to omit any mention of Mr. Sankey, who contributed so much to the interest of the services. His songs may not compare with the hymns and spiritual songs of the Churches. We need not deplore our lack of either; but we yet need a combination of song and tune in which the conditions of true taste and the requirements of the untutored are both met. The day may come when the sentiment of the song will be supreme, and the music compelled to relax its rigidity and to subserve that sentiment as it did in Mr. Sankey's case. No one who approves our cathedral anthem can fairly object to the solo singing. They rest upon the same basis, while the latter had the distinctive feature of being sung truly to the glory of God and the edification of the people.

A review of the whole work has left on our minds the belief that amongst the contributing external causes of its success the chief lies in the condition of the various evangelical churches of the land, in the widespread and deep religious interest excited by the fruit of the toils and the conflicts of the past thirty years; the intense interest felt by the members of all churches in the spiritual welfare of the multitude, causing them to hurry with delight to witness the works of mercy, the spiritual healing of the many sick. The novelty of some of the methods may have arrested attention and drawn some to attend from mere curiosity; but the growing force of the work, the startling statements of success which came floating on every wind, drew those whose presence was spiritually helpful. Further than which we believe the ministers and members of the various churches rejoiced to welcome a means by which they could realise and declare their ideal unity. With this, unquestionably, the world around was very deeply impressed.

If to these we add the gracious attestation and help of the Divine Spirit, which with the Holy Scriptures open before us we could not hesitate to acknowledge, we may find some if not all of those great forces which were in operation to produce effects over which the churches of the land have cause to rejoice with gratitude, and which forces are still available for future and greater works.

To all Christian workers this book may be confidently commended, the probability being that it will suggest to them many ways in which they can more widely use their talents for the general good.



*The Atonement. The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875.* By R. W. Dale, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

THIS new series of Lectures, which may be regarded as taking the place of the well-known *Congregational Lecture* of other days, has received a valuable addition in Mr. Dale's work on the Atonement. It is characterised by intellectual vigour and by moral force and freshness. The writer is earnest, the style eloquent and manly, while in the present condition of theological thought it is particularly cheering to find the objective and propitiatory character of the Atonement maintained throughout, and the doctrine of Redemption investigated in a spirit of heartiest loyalty to the Word written and to the Word Incarnate. In the hope of commending these thoughtful and able Lectures to our readers, and more particularly to those interested in the study of theology, we give a short outline of Mr. Dale's treatment of the subject.

He begins with a distinction, to which he afterwards frequently refers, between the death of Christ as a *fact*, and the *doctrine or theory* concerning it. It is no disparagement of theological science, but, on the contrary, a necessary preparation for it, to state clearly that it is not the doctrine of the death of Christ that atones for human sin, but the death itself. Though it is of the utmost importance that the death of Christ should be rightly thought of, its proper effects may follow even where that is not the case. Were it not so, the history of the divergence of religious opinion would be indefinitely more depressing than it is. There are great difficulties, perhaps insuperable ones, in the way of any complete and adequate theory of the Atonement. Such questions as the eternal relations between the Son of God and the Father, the original relation of the Son of God to our own race, the nature of the law of righteousness, and the nature and necessity of punishment,—these and other, perhaps insoluble, problems are all connected with the doctrine of the Atonement. And yet, acknowledging these difficulties, we are compelled to theorise. "It is doubtful whether it lies within our power to remain neutral in the presence of conflicting theories of the Atonement. There are two leading conceptions of the death of Christ between which we must choose: The fundamental question, whether the death of Christ has a direct relation to the remission of sins, or whether it was simply a great appeal of the Divine love to the human race—'God's method of conquering the human heart'—determines the whole attitude of the Christian soul to Christ. One of these two conceptions we must accept, one we must reject, not merely as theologians but as Christians." The object of these lectures is then stated, viz., "to show that there is a direct relation between the death of Christ and the remission of sins, and to investigate

the principles and grounds of that relation; first, to establish a fact, and then to attempt the construction of a theory."

Assuming, then, that the Lord Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh, His *history* must be examined in relation to this fact. That history exhibits Christ revealing God more in what He was, in what He did, and in what He suffered than in what He taught. Our Lord was not primarily a teacher. The immeasurable distance between Him and the prophets was not in His teaching, but in that which He was and did. This being so, we notice the exceptional importance ascribed by the Evangelists to our Lord's last sufferings, while in the importance they attach to His death, they are but following the line of His own thought. It is shown that His death was distinctly present to Him from the very commencement of His ministry, and that He constantly spoke of it as necessary to the accomplishment of His mission. After a careful review of the circumstances attending the Passion, the writer says, "Surely this supreme anguish must have a unique relation to the redemption of mankind. If not, why was it that the anticipation of His death was associated with some of the greatest moments in His history? Why did He speak of it to Peter, when Peter confessed that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God? Why did it occur to Him when the Greeks came to speak to Him at the feast? Why did He institute a religious rite to commemorate it?"

The testimony of our Lord to the fact of the Atonement is next examined. He declared that His "blood of the new covenant was shed *for the remission of sins*," a thing which He never affirmed of His teaching, or miracles, or His life-long humiliation. He claimed to be the Good Shepherd, and declared His *intention* to die for the flock. The shepherd that dies defending his flock does not die voluntarily; he dies because the wolf is too strong for him; but our Lord declares that it is not to be so with Him: "I lay down my life. . . . No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." The whole tenor of our Lord's language respecting His death indicates its unique character. It was not the incidental or inevitable consequence of His collision with the passions and prejudices of the Jews. It was voluntary. To lay down His life was one of the ends for which He came into the world. He associated His death with the sacrifice of the passover lamb on the night of the Exodus. He described His death as a death for others, and more specifically He said that He gave His life a ransom for others. Thus before passing on to the Epistles, Mr. Dale is able to show that the Lord's own testimony gives the key-note of New-Testament teaching respecting the Atonement. "Let the Gospels stand alone, let the testimony of the Epistles be completely suppressed, and the strong foundations of that conception of the death of Christ which has been the refuge of

penitents and the joy of saints for 1800 years will remain unshaken. The words of Christ, and the words of Christ alone, are a sufficient indication of the ancient faith of the Church."

The three following lectures are devoted to an examination of the Apostolic testimony to the Atonement. The review of the Pauline doctrine of redemption is particularly worthy of study for its grasp of great principles, and its vigorous logical method. But before exhibiting the results of examination into the teaching of the Apostles, there is an objection of considerable importance to be noticed. The attempt has been made to distinguish between our Lord's own teaching and that of His Apostles, and to represent the latter as an insufficient basis for a doctrine which is said to be "irreconcilable with God's character and our own spiritual consciousness." It is first assumed that the Apostolic teaching is the only basis for the doctrine of an objective Atonement, and then that it is inadequate, inasmuch as that teaching may rest upon misapprehension, arising from various causes. Mr. Dale manifests much logical power and acuteness in discussing this objection. He shows that it is incredible that our Lord should have invested with such a commission men capable of completely misunderstanding His ideas, and substituting for them what is called "an appalling misconception of the Divine character and of the principles of the Divine government." To waive the question of a supernatural inspiration qualifying them to become the religious teachers of mankind, how was it possible for men of the most ordinary capacity so grievously to corrupt and pervert the teaching of their Master? If it could be shown that they misconceived the very nature of the Atonement they were commissioned to preach, it would be an impeachment of the wisdom of Him who appointed them, such as is not, perhaps, contemplated by the objectors referred to. After the resurrection of our Lord, and the forty days during which "He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures," speaking to them of "the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God;" after the Lord had said, "I have given unto them the words Thou gavest me," and had prayed for those "who should believe on Him through their word;" after He had solemnly blessed them, and commissioned them to be witnesses unto Him to "the uttermost part of the earth," it is impossible to believe that they went away with a radically erroneous conception of His death and resurrection without admitting that the Lord's confidence in them was misplaced, or, in other words, reversing the testimony of the Spirit, He needed that one should testify of man; for He knew not what was in man.

At the close of a long and able review of the Scriptural evidence to the *fact* of the Atonement, Mr. Dale shows, with great *force*, that it was not theology that invented the *idea* of the

Atonement, but that it has been the ever-renewed task of theologians to construct theories of the previously-existing ideas. The Fathers, the Schoolmen, the Reformers, laboured successively to frame an adequate theory of that objective Atonement which they found asserted in Scripture. The attempt of historical theology is thus summed up:—

“From this brief review of the history of the doctrine, it appears that for nearly a thousand years many of the most eminent teachers of the Church were accustomed to represent the death of Christ as a ransom by which we are delivered from captivity to the devil; that for nearly five centuries the most eminent teachers of the Church were accustomed to represent the death of Christ as an act of personal homage to the personal greatness and majesty of God; that during the last three centuries the great Protestant Churches have represented the death of Christ as having a relation neither to the Devil nor to the personal claim of God, but to the moral order of the universe. . . . The Fathers attempted to explain why it is that through the death of Christ we escape from the penalties of sin, and their explanations were rejected by the Schoolmen. The Schoolmen attempted to explain it, and their explanations were rejected or modified by the Reformers. The Reformers attempted to explain it, and within a century after the Reformation Grotius and his successors were attempting to explain it again. But the faith of the great body of the Church in the fact that Christ's sufferings came upon Him because of our sin, and that on the ground of His sufferings we are delivered from the penalties of sin, has survived the theories which were intended to illustrate it.

“The idea of an objective atonement invented by theologians to satisfy the exigencies of theological systems! It would be almost as reasonable to maintain that the apparent motion of the sun was invented by astronomers in order to satisfy the exigencies created by astronomical theories. The idea has perplexed, and troubled, and broken up successive systems of theology. It was precisely because they failed to account for it that theological systems, which were once famous and powerful, and from which their authors hoped for an immortal name, have perished. If it had been possible to expel the idea from the faith of Christendom, then the task of theology would have been made wonderfully easier. The history of the doctrine is a proof that the idea of an objective atonement was not invented by theologians.”

In the last two chapters Mr. Dale passes from the consideration of the Atonement as a *fact* to the investigation of the *theory*, or explanation of the fact. The representations of the Death of Christ as a Ransom, as a Vicarious Death, as a Propitiation for Sins, do not constitute a theory. Each of these representations expresses an idea proper to itself, not included in the others.

The true theory must account for and explain these descriptions. What is that fundamental relation of the Death of Christ to human redemption which underlies all the illustrations employed to set it forth? It is here that Mr. Dale approaches the great difficulty of his subject, and he measures the difficulty too well to speak confidently of success. It is something to point out the direction in which the answer may be supposed to lie, and this is effected by stating the final inquiry in this form:—

“1. What is the original relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and the eternal Law of Righteousness, of which sin is the transgression?”

“2. What is the original relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and the race whose sins needed remission?”

Assuming that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, *is* God, what is His relation to the Law of Righteousness? The hypothesis that the *will* of God is the origin of the distinction between right and wrong, and the ultimate ground of moral obligation, is put aside, after a sufficient statement of the difficulties it involves. But the writer does not appear to us to deal so satisfactorily with the theory that finds these distinctions in the *nature* of God. After giving it up as untenable, and rightly rejecting the notion that there can be an independent and supreme Law of Righteousness to which God Himself is subject even as we are, he says:—“The relation between God and the eternal Law of Righteousness is unique. He is not, as we are, bound by its authority; in Him its authority is actively asserted . . . The law does not claim Him as the most illustrious and glorious of its subjects; it is supreme in His supremacy. His relation to the law is not a relation of subjection, but of identity.” This is, as we think, to admit the essential principle of the theory that finds the Law of Righteousness in the nature of God. But the writer’s style becomes a little rhetorical just where it should be most precise, and it is possible that we do not clearly catch his meaning.

He then investigates the idea of punishment, and shows very clearly that it is not a mere reformatory process, intended to promote the moral benefit of the sufferer, nor yet an expedient for strengthening the authority of the law by creating a new motive to obedience. The proper idea of punishment, as pain or loss inflicted for the violation of a law, is not to be confounded with the related ideas of moral discipline and prevention of evil. “Suffering inflicted upon a man to make him better in the future is not punishment, but discipline: to be punishment, it must be inflicted for evil deeds done in the past. Suffering endured for the sake of benefiting society is not punishment; if accepted voluntarily, it is the heroism of self-sacrifice; if inflicted by arbitrary authority, it is injustice on the one side, and martyrdom on the other. . . That the suffering inflicted is deserved is a necessary

element in the conception of punishment." This being so, and the punishment of sin a Divine act, in which the identity of God's will and the eternal Law of Righteousness is asserted and expressed, it would appear that, if in any case the penalties of sin are remitted, some other Divine act of at least equal intensity, and in which the ill desert of sin is expressed with at least equal energy, must take its place. This Divine act was the death of Christ. The principle that sin deserves punishment is asserted in our Lord Jesus Christ assuming our nature, being forsaken of God, and dying upon the cross that the sins of men might be remitted.

But this view of Christ's relation to the Law of Righteousness requires to be associated with some adequate view of His relation to the human race, before the theory of the Atonement can be constructed. Here Mr. Dale acknowledges that a question arises which has been but little examined. He suggests it as one of the great inquiries which theological science must yet pursue. What is that relation of Christ to mankind which renders it possible for Him to sustain a representative character? What is the ground of that relation of Christ to men which underlies the great thought, "If one died for all, then all died?" That such a relation exists, in virtue of which Christ's death was truly vicarious, and not merely reckoned as such, there can be little doubt. It is here that Mr. Dale's lectures close. He has stated the terms of a great inquiry towards which his own contribution is modest, but valuable for its insight and suggestiveness. One service he renders by his clear and vigorous thinking is to point out what are the mysteries of his profound subject, and how they are related to each other. Both as students and as Christians it is of importance to us to know what are the departments of revealed truth that have been surveyed, mapped out, and thrown open for travellers of every grade; and where are the unexplored regions that lie waiting for those pioneer spirits that can lead the way in exploration, and add new regions to the rich inheritance of our knowledge of Divine things. We should have been glad, if space had permitted, to increase our extracts from this valuable and deeply interesting work. It is a contribution to theological science which we heartily commend to thoughtful readers, and for which we may offer our thanks to Mr. Dale, and our congratulations to the promoters of the *Congregational Union Lecture*.

*The State of the Dead.* By the Rev. Anson West. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co. 1871.

THESE chapters treat of the resurrection of the body and the sensible existence of the soul during the period of its separation



from it, of the belief in witchcraft, metempsychosis and purgatory, of the intermediate state and the termination of the state of the dead. Of purgatory the discussion is pretty ample, extending over four chapters, or about a hundred pages. Of the intermediate state the view taken by the author is that souls at death go immediately to heaven or hell, and not into any place or state that can be properly termed the antechamber of either. Probably no one would seriously controvert this view: the term "antechamber" is, itself, perhaps, a figure in the mouth of those who have used it, intended to show the difference between the condition of the departed as yet unclothed with their spiritual bodies, and as yet unblessed with the knowledge of the final triumph and completion of the Church, and that of the same blessed spirits after the time of "the manifestation of the Sons of God." The book contains many useful observations and some sound reasoning.

*The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement.*

By Thomas J. Crawford, D.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons. 1875.

WE are glad to see a second edition of Professor Crawford's work on the Atonement, which we welcomed on its first appearance four years ago. The method adopted is simple but effective. In the first place the passages of the New Testament bearing upon the subject are classified and submitted to a careful induction, the results of which are given in a general and comprehensive statement that forms the doctrinal kernel of the volume.

This classification of New Testament passages is both ample and accurate, and an admirable example of the method of Biblical Theology. With regard to the conclusions at which Professor Crawford arrives we can only repeat our hearty assent to them, his limitation of the universality of the Atonement always excepted. He adopts the statement of the Westminster Confession that "to all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same." Volumes have been written—to which we shall not add a single page—for and against the view above expressed. The controversy has its roots in philosophy rather than in theology, and, from various causes, has come to have comparatively little interest for the speculative minds of Christendom. Judging by Dr. Crawford's statements of what Arminian principles mean or lead to, and knowing that they do not mean or lead to what he says they ought to do, we willingly concede that our own statements in return of the meaning and tendency of Calvinist principles would



in all probability be equally erroneous. We therefore forbear to make them, and with this concession pass on.

The sacrificial institutions and prophetic intimations of the Old Testament are then examined and compared with the results already arrived at. Then follows a review of the various theories respecting the sufferings of Christ, associated with the names of Mr. Maurice, Dr. Young, Dr. Bushnell, and Robertson of Brighton. This is perhaps the most useful, as well as the ablest, portion of the whole work. In the present edition a valuable chapter is added to this section, containing general remarks on the theories reviewed. Most of the theories of the Atonement which we are obliged to regard as defective, not only contain a portion of truth, but a portion which has been to some extent neglected or overlooked by defenders of the Catholic doctrine. For example, the rash and injudicious statements employed in popular religious language, tending to convey the impression that our Lord's sufferings were designed to avert from us the wrath of an implacable Being, have done something to provoke the theory that represents the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ as *merely* a display of the love of God to sinners, and ignores the great propitiation. But "whatever truth is contained in such theories is not in the least degree inconsistent with the Catholic doctrine, but may be maintained to the fullest extent along with it." This remark is well worth the student's attention. He will find that many a theory of the Atonement, insufficient and erroneous as a theory, expresses some view of the great mystery which may help to enrich his theology, and save him from narrow or one-sided statements of truth.

The fourth and last part is a review of some of the leading objections to the Scriptural doctrine of the Atonement. These are candidly stated, and ably dealt with.

The method adopted by Professor Crawford in this work is such as to meet the requirements of students. The earlier portion of it forms an admirable handbook to the Biblical theology of the Atonement, and the discussions that follow give a fair *résumé* of recent conflicting theories.

*The Primitive and Catholic Faith in Relation to the Church of England.* By the Rev. Burchier Wray Savile, M.A., Rector of Shillingford, Exeter, Author of "The Truth of the Bible," &c., &c. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1875.

THE object of this work, according to the introduction, is "to show the resemblance between the doctrines of the Reformed Church of England, as interpreted by the 'Evangelical' party, and those held and taught by the Primitive Church in the earliest

and purest days of her existence, as well as to urge upon all the duty of cultivating a closer communion with other Protestant churches who hold the same faith with ourselves, though not under Episcopal government." In doing so the author shows the groundlessness of the claim made by the Ritualists to be the sole exponents of primitive faith and practice. It is abundantly proved that, so far from this being the case, some centuries must have elapsed from the foundation of the Church during which the peculiarities of Ritualism and Popery were altogether unknown; and that in subsequent times those very things were denounced as dangerous innovations and deadly heresies which in these latter days have been palmed off on credulous people as elements of pristine Christianity. Mr. Savile goes over the whole ground of the controversy with the Ritualists, treating of the Lord's Supper, together with the cognate questions of altar, sacrifice, and real presence; of vestments, lights, incense, the eastward position, auricular confession, priestly absolution, prayer for the dead, and pictures and images. The merits of these questions are pretty familiar to most of our readers; but to any who are not so this book will afford useful information on one of the most important controversies of the age.

*On the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures.*  
 With an Account of the Revision now in Progress.  
 By Henry Charles Fox, LL.B. London: Hodder and  
 Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1875.

ORIGINALLY delivered as a lecture before the Young Men's Christian Association at Plymouth, it presents the leading facts and arguments connected with the subject of revision in a form adapted for those readers who have not means to acquire, or time to study, the larger works on the subject.

*The Theological Instructor.* A Scriptural View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of the Christian Religion. For the use of Sunday-schools, Bible-classes, and Young Students on Theology. By the Rev. Richard Pritchard. Translated from the Third Welsh Edition by the Rev. John Hugh Morgan. London: G. Philip and Son.

THIS is a good catechetical teacher; it has been very useful in Welsh, and is well worth translating. Those for whom it is designed will find it serviceable; and more advanced students will not regret the time spent in consulting it.

## II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Life of Napoleon III. Derived from State Records, from Unpublished Family Correspondence, and from Personal Testimony.* By Blanchard Jerrold. In Four Volumes. Vols. I. and II. London: Longmans. 1874-5.

THE first two volumes of Mr. Blanchard Jerrold's *Life of Napoleon* bring us to September, 1848. Prince Napoleon was then in his fortieth year. After much danger and trouble, and years of exile and imprisonment, the Revolution of 1848 gave him his chance. He was elected to the Assembly, and, once admitted into the political life of France, his pursuit of power was carried on with new resources, but with all the former steadiness of aim. We do not think that Mr. Jerrold has, thus far, added much to what was previously known of Napoleon's career. With all its principal events the world was already well acquainted. The personal incidents, the anecdotes, the family letters appearing for the first time in these volumes will be interesting to many, but the deeper interest attaching to careful analysis of character, and impartial examination of political conduct and principles, is wholly wanting. Mr. Jerrold is an Englishman, and a very capable writer,—perhaps no one is better able than he to afford the literary help which the Imperial family may require—but the advantage of the “help abundantly bestowed by the Imperial family” is his disadvantage so far as the higher purposes of biography are concerned. Imperialism did not die with the late Emperor. It still represents the ideas, aspirations, and intrigues of a considerable party, and it cannot afford to have the history of its last great representative written in any way that will not serve its interests. From the nature of the case, the biography of the ex-Emperor, produced or sanctioned by his family, must be apologetic. The Napoleonic ideas, discredited by recent disasters, must be expounded afresh, and vindicated, if it may be, from failure; while in making the very best of a past that requires much defending, the possible future has to be borne in mind. No secrets can be told but those that are no longer worth keeping, and the reader may be pretty sure that the most candid revelations will never go beyond the bounds of political prudence. This consideration compels us to say beforehand that we do not expect the later volumes of this biography to be of any great value. A history of the *coup d'état* and of the Empire, written in friendly

co-operation with the most distinguished members of the Imperial family, will have an interest of its own; but for the truth and the whole truth respecting the man and the system that fell together in 1870, one must not look to those who are still aiming at the restoration of the Empire. The materials for a complete and final estimate of Napoleon's career may not be yet accessible. In this, as in other instances, it is time alone that will both bring hidden things to light, and afford the perspective in which they can be rightly viewed. But, with many things left for future decision, it is even now irresistibly clear which way the verdict must go. It may hereafter be modified, or it may be strengthened, but no reversal is to be looked for of that deep disapproval which the moral and political sense of the world has pronounced upon French Imperialism. Its wisdom has been shown to be no wisdom at all, but a selfish, worldly statecraft, very slightly influenced by lofty political motives, and hopelessly beaten at last in its own chosen departments of strength, arms and diplomacy. At the present time the political prospects of France are not cheering, though the wonderful vitality of the nation was never more apparent; but among the changes that may take place there is none, in our judgment, more to be deprecated than a revival of the Empire. In the world of political ideas there are none that seem to us more heartless and immoral than those by which the Second Empire rose and fell.

We do not for a moment contend that the character of Louis Napoleon was one of exceptional iniquity. He was capable of friendship and affection, and had the power, all through life, of inspiring others with attachment to himself. He was devotedly served by his more intimate associates, though deceived and swindled by whole flocks of followers. He was no tyrant in the old-fashioned melodramatic sense of delighting to oppress, but he had an altogether insufficient apprehension of right and wrong. He was a conspicuous example of the class of men who do right when there is no motive for doing wrong, but—beware of such when their plans are crossed, or their interests are at stake. We do not suppose that the massacre of the *coup d'état*, and the wholesale transportations that followed, gave Louis Napoleon any pleasure: we see no reason to believe that they caused him any pain.

In the sixth chapter of the second volume Mr. Jerrold gives an account of the "Napoleonic Tradition:"—"The *Idees Napoléoniennes* are the brightest and fullest expression of the mind of Prince Louis Napoleon that he has left to the world. His political life is this work in action. By its light his conduct as President and Emperor must be judged. It explains not only his behaviour in power, but the means by which he reached it. It is the text-book of his policy, the code of his personal law, the last

result of his unwearied study of the man by the lamp of whose genius he guided every footstep, and under whose inspiration he lived and died. Yet these *Idées Napoléoniennes* are not a mere summary of the intellectual manifestations of Napoleon I.; they are rather new developments of it, applications of it to the changed aspects of the political world, the Napoleonic idea amplified and carried forward for the government of society by a second Napoleon. The genius of the interpreter is of a more liberal caste than that of the creator. Prince Louis was, in his youth, and remained to the close of his life, a Radical. His earliest work proclaims this, and his latest political act is evidence of his steadfastness in this faith. His rule, as it is laid down in these *Ideas*, and as he manifested himself in the purple, might have been summed up in the device—"Liberty, Equality, Authority."

The extracts from the *Idées Napoléoniennes* which follow, selected by Mr. Jerrold in explanation of the Napoleonic tradition, should be carefully read by any who yet doubt the essential insincerity of Louis Napoleon's character. Political manifestoes are seldom characterised by a rigorous regard for truth; Frenchmen in particular love sound and glitter in such utterances; the first Napoleon had carried the art of writing mendacious proclamations to a pitch that could not easily be surpassed; but for utter hollowness, for the ring of insincerity from first to last, we know nothing to compare with the *Idées Napoléoniennes*. The sense of humour is not the same in France that it is in England, or the bombastic sentences, with their precious freight of pretentious philosophy and historical falsehood, would have been killed with ridicule. There are whole paragraphs in which the exaggerated heroics seem continually on the point of passing into broad farce. Perhaps it is that we who saw the working out of the Napoleonic ideas during the twenty years of the second empire find it more difficult to keep our countenance in reading them than their first readers did; but it is difficult to believe that there was any class of people a generation ago with ears so little trained as to mistake such stuff as this for truth: "The Napoleonic idea has as many branches as there are phases of human genius. It vivifies agriculture; it invents new products; it borrows useful inventions from foreign countries; it levels mountains, spans rivers, facilitates intercommunication, and compels nations to shake hands; it gives work to all hands and all capacities; it enters the cottage, not holding forth barren declarations about the rights of man, but with means to slake the poor man's thirst, to quench his hunger, and with a glorious story to awaken his patriotism. The Napoleonic idea is like the evangelical idea. It shuns luxury, and needs neither pomp nor show to make it prevail; it is only as a last resource that it invokes the god of armies. Humble

without meanness, it strikes at every door, meets opprobrium without rancour, and moves onward unceasingly, because there is light in front, and the people follow. . . . The Napoleonic idea is, in the very nature of it, an idea of peace rather than of war,—an idea of reconstitution rather than an idea of dismemberment. It possesses, without rancour or hate, the political moral which the great man was the first to conceive; it developes those great principles of justice, authority, and liberty which are too often forgotten in troublous times. . . . Great men have this in common with the Divinity, that they do not wholly die. Their spirit survives them, and the Napoleonic idea has sprung from the tomb of St. Helena, as the moral of the Evangelist rose triumphant from the agony of Calvary."

It is needless to say anything of the wretched taste of this composition. Its inflated rhetoric and unbounded conceit might be allowed to pass, but one is inclined to wonder how the writer could expect even the most ignorant to believe such a reading of history as this. "The political moral which the great man was the first to conceive" was surely exhibited to the world in his career. Napoleon I. expounded his own ideas with sufficient clearness from Rome to Moscow, and from Spain to Egypt, and they can hardly be misunderstood. One has but to recall his boundless ambition, his perfect selfishness, his habitual untruthfulness, the many base uses to which he put his noble genius, to feel the irony of ascribing to the Napoleonic idea "the development of those great principles of justice, authority, and liberty, which are too often forgotten in troublous times." The new evangel, which is more than once compared to Christianity, presents the name of Napoleon for adoration, and professes to derive its healing and regenerating mission from his inspired genius. Surely it required a quality which we will not call boldness, though we hesitate to give its proper designation, to take that name as the watchword of liberty, justice, and moral progress. It can never be out of date to protest against the crimes of military and political life. It has been well said that "the true moral feeling in regard to the crimes of public men is almost to be created." No dramatic splendour of events can atone for cruelty, falsehood, and selfishness, and "not all the waters of the rough, rude sea" can wash these dark stains from the character of Napoleon. The spoliation of Italy, the unprovoked invasion of Egypt, and the massacre of Jaffa, the establishment of military despotism in France, with all its accompaniments of *espionage*, corruption, and intellectual enslavement, the murder of the Duke d'Enghien, the parcelling out of Europe amongst his brothers and principal followers in defiance of every sentiment of honour and every principle of right,—these are the real exposition of the Napoleonic idea, and not the tawdry eloquence of

the *Îles Napoléoniennes*. Mr. Jerrold says that "this work exhibits a striking and intimate knowledge of the character of the French people;" this may be true, but it is a heavy charge to bring against the French. It would be impossible to feel anything but profound compassion for a people whose capacity had been rightly gauged by the author of such a work.

Mr. Jerrold relates with considerable minuteness the history of the Strasburg and Boulogne failures. After the trial which followed the earlier attempt Louis Napoleon, as is well known, was sent to America. He landed on the 30th March, 1837, and re-embarked for Europe on the 12th of the following June. It is a little difficult to understand the tone of complaint in which Mr. Jerrold writes of the prince's banishment and exile. The game of pretenders is confessedly a dangerous one. Men who aim at possessing themselves of a throne know very well that as the stake is high the risk is great. All things considered, Louis Napoleon was fortunate beyond precedent in the extremely mild measures adopted towards him after two unsuccessful attempts to raise the nation against the existing government. After the first failure he was sent to America, sufficiently provided with funds, released without *parole*, in such perfect freedom that in less than three months he returned to Europe. After the Boulogne affair he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in the château of Ham, from which he escaped at the end of five years. Considering the laws of the kind of enterprise in which he engaged, and the severity with which they have generally been enforced, it will be admitted that the trip to America and the five years at Ham were not excessive penalties for two abortive attempts upon a throne.

The prince's letters from America are entertaining. He writes to his mother:—

"On April 2 the captain and officers conducted me to Baltimore, across the Gulf of Chesapeake. We left at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. There were 200 passengers on board. The cabin reaches the entire length of the boat. It is a narrow room about 160 feet in length. Supper was served at seven. Half-an-hour later the tables were swept away, and beds were made for everybody. The women have cabins apart. The spectacle of these 200 beds pell-mell in a big room, afloat, and travelling at the rate of fifteen miles an hour, was really a curious one. About four in the morning, being very hot, I got up and went on deck, to get some fresh air. I had hardly reached the deck when I saw a gentleman following me in his shirt, who seemed to wish to speak to me. After having made the tour of the ship twice, he at length accosted me. He began with the customary 'Very beautiful night, sir.' Then he said, 'Would you have the kindness, sir, to relate to me your history?' I almost laughed in his face. But I restrained myself, and answered that the remembrance of what



had befallen me was too painful to allow of my complying with his request. So we talked about other things; and presently, the wind being very cold, he deemed it prudent to get his coat."

The dangerous illness of his mother was the cause of Louis Napoleon's sudden return to Europe. His attachment to her was deep and consistent throughout. He arrived at Arenenberg in time to cheer her last moments. Mr. Jerrold thus sketches the character of Queen Hortense:—"Queen Hortense has left seven or eight compact volumes of Memoirs, which in their entirety are never to be published. They were designed for the reading of her own family, and were intended to explain the complicated, unhappy, and not blameless life of the writer. They are full of exaggerations and indiscretions, of high-flown sentiments, and hasty verdicts on men and women. Throughout there is evidence of a generous spirit, a warm heart, and of a penetrating mind. The intimate descriptions of Napoleon are in many passages admirable, and would be valuable to history as showing the warmer side of his character. When the queen touches on her wedded life she represents her husband as a domestic tyrant with whom it was impossible to live; but then it is easy to see by the context that what she called tyranny was the endeavour of a serious and solitary man to curb the wild exuberance of a worldly, society-loving, even frivolous woman, who found most of her pleasure away from the fireside, and who had been spoiled by the adoration of a brilliant court. It is to be remarked that though she resented King Louis's tyranny and gloom, she never ceased to respect him. She knew that she had not been a good wife to him, and in her will she acknowledged it. Her frailties were beyond question, nor does she deny them in the final record of her life. She explains, idealises, and moralises, seeking to bewitch rather than to satisfy the judgment of the reader. . . . It cannot be denied that the effect exercised by Queen Hortense on the character of her son Louis was enervating. She was a lover and seeker of pleasure to the last. All her friends were delightful and cultivated companions. She loved letters and the arts. The learned man was ever welcome to her board. But she was no strict mistress of morals. There was much of what we understand as the Bohemian in her nature. Cottrau the artist was allowed about the château in a costume that would have charmed the grisettes of the Quartier Latin. She liked expeditions *à la bonne franquette*, to use a Paris vulgarism. In Rome her parties were of the liveliest, and in those days strict morals made no part of the estimate when the value or desirability of a lady's society was under consideration. . . . The pleasures, the conversation, the southern *brio*, that threw a rosy tint about slips in morals, were enervating surroundings to the young man whose single hand was to hold sway and mastery over an empire. In after life Prince

Louis showed deep traces of both the good and the evil of his mother's teaching and the society in which she brought him up. The good blossomed in a thousand acts of kindness, and the evil appeared in many weaknesses—all those of a tender heart,—for which a bitter penalty was paid in the end."

We have said enough to show that we cannot agree with Mr. Jerrold in his estimate of his hero. We do not think his work a valuable one, but we willingly admit that it is interesting, though his style appears to us to have suffered from the study of Imperial literature, and, in some degree, to have caught its vice of grandiloquence.

*Pilgrim Memories; or, Travel and Discussion in the Birth-Countries of Christianity with the late Henry Thomas Buckle.* By John S. Stuart-Glennie, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Longmans. 1875.

MR. BUCKLE was a man of prodigious reading, of vast research, and (where his theories did not mar him) of considerable critical acumen. He had a wonderful memory, and a rare power of grouping facts around the central thought with which he was dealing. The facts were not always apposite; what he meant for stout buttresses, and believed to be such, outsiders could sometimes see were merely poles stuck loosely into the ground, and really disconnected with what they were intended to support. But, anyhow, Mr. Buckle has done enough to give any "additional memorials" of him a value in the eyes of the reading world. We never tire of hearing about the delicate boy whose love for his mother was an absorbing passion, while she, whose creed was so different from his, used to console herself during her long illness with the thought: "Surely God will let me live to see Henry's book." The first volume of the *History of Civilisation*, so strange a work for him "whose only boyish game was parson and clerk, himself being the preacher," appeared in June, 1857; and in less than two years Mrs. Buckle died, leaving her son the strong conviction that they would meet again—"We never really die," is his phrase)—but the feeling that, before that reunion, there awaited him "some thirty years of fame, of power, and of desolation." Within a year and a half he found his health giving way; and felt that, so far from completing the vast task which he had set himself, he could scarcely reckon on bringing out a second volume. The second volume, however, appeared in May, 1861; and in October Mr. Buckle set out for Egypt, dying at Damascus at the end of the following May, of diarrhoea and typhus, induced by physical exhaustion.

Mr. Glennie met him at the great cataract, in January, 1862, and plunged at once into a long talk about "Spiritism" and the hypothesis

of mutual influence and reciprocal action. Mr. Buckle, who had seen Mr. Home floating in the air, was as ardent a "Spiritist" as he was a believer in immortality; indeed, as Mr. Glennie well remarks, "The cold deism which he professed needs a theory of spirits; for if men have not in their religious, they must in their other beliefs, have stimulants for the imagination and food for the affections. . . . 'Man cannot live by bread alone,' cannot live without the ideal; and the fit idealism of a materialist age is this new necromancy of Homianism." Six weeks later our author again met Mr. Buckle, at Cairo, and accepted his proposal to join him on his journey into Syria and elsewhere. Unhappily he left him wretchedly ill in Damascus, under the charge of a French doctor, while he made an expedition to Baalbec. He could have done no "good" by staying; the poor worn-out student, who had been too ill to sit his horse the day of his entry into the city, and had had to crawl painfully on foot, first across a desert plateau (p. 448), and then up the dark, ill-paved streets of Damascus (p. 451), was clearly in a dying state; and, besides the doctor, there were Lady Ellenborough's English maid, and an American missionary, the Rev. Smylie Robson. What could have been the use of keeping in "the valley of the shadow of death" a Humanitarian, who was "burdened with the idea of that oneness of mankind, the realisation of which will make, at length, of the whole earth a paradise"? The new philosophy is confessedly weak in works as it is in sanctions; and, though Mr. Glennie is fully able to explain his absence from his companion's death-bed, we cannot help thinking that some hide-bound votaries of the worn-out creeds would have stayed on, no matter at what sacrifice.

All Mr. Glennie's facts about this sad ending of such a life are very interesting; we have met most of them before (some of his papers are reprints from *Fraser* and elsewhere), but they bear repetition. There is a strange pleasure in noting the littlenesses of such a man—littlenesses due to his birth and education—what the *Athenæum* called "a certain selfishness, love of money, and effeminacy;" in picturing his extraordinary dress—old swallow-tailed coat, and flannels a vast deal too thick, which he preferred sweating under to changing them for new thin ones; in speculating what sort of a tutor he may have been—for he had two lads entrusted to him; and in following the discussions, in which Mr. Glennie "traverses" his friend's strictures on Scottish character and Scotch theology. For all this we are grateful to Mr. Glennie—are glad that he kept a good diary, and that he was able, twelve years after, first in the solitude of the Black Forest (he calls it the *Schwartzwald*), and then "on a mountain-side in the greater Scottish forest, in which tower Lochnagar and Ben-muich-dhui," to put his diary into shape. But we object to surprises, and do not care to have recollections of travel with Mr. Buckle made "the *proœmium* of

the Modern Revolution." Mr. Glennie has discovered "the Ultimate Law of History." He promises to verify his discovery (which he defines as "a certain Change and Process of Change in men's notions of the causes of Change") in a series of works, of which the first, entitled *In the Morningland*, will be an *introductory historical analysis*; the last, "a new music drama, entitled *King Arthur*," will be a *concluding poetical synthesis*. But, at present, we can find little in his dogmatic paragraphs except capital letters and new-fangled words ("the New Ideal," Naturianism, Homianism, &c.), wildly tortuous sentences, and a punctuation which seems as if commas had been peppered loosely about it to puzzle instead of to guide the anxious reader. Yes, there is one thing more to which we are sorry to have to advert, and which may be guessed from Mr. Glennie's persistently calling the supreme God of the Jews *Yahveh*, and from his speaking of Buddhism, Christianity, and Islamism as "three individualist religions," in contrast with "the socialist religion of Humanitarianism." Mr. Glennie is not a Christian; he is a Humanitarian, though (as he is careful to explain) not wholly of M. Comte's type. "The new theory summarised in his Ultimate Law" is antagonist to the Christian theory of history, and no reconciliation between them is possible; "a change in men's notions of the Causes of Change is a change in their conception of God, and hence the needed New Mythology for Art will be supplied by the Arthurian Romance." (!)

No wonder the *Edinburgh Review* says (in one of the Press-notices, complacently quoted at the end of the volume before us): "If the reader would measure the preposterous lengths to which the intoxicating cup of modern science will lead some men, let him read Mr. Stuart-Glennie's books." To our thinking the preposterous in his volumes is often mingled with the comic. Here is a case in point. The walk across the desert, and the fierce heat of Damascus, which killed Mr. Buckle, made Mr. Glennie uncomfortable. "But the body relieved itself by one or two rushes of blood from the nose; and so, without harm, thought was stimulated to its swiftest and most discursive flight; and the soul was, for the most part, wrapped in a magical entrancement" (p. 453). The best of it is Mr. Glennie is wholly unconscious of anything ridiculous; he evidently thinks he has penned one of his most telling sentences. Again, after describing the visit to the "Wells of Moses," he summarises a day in the desert, beginning with "tea, eggs, curry and rice, with camel's milk and Scotch marmalade," and ending with "light sherry, or claret cooled in a tub in the shade, and the creaming Turkish coffee, cigars, and pleasant talk," and asks whether "a realisation of what I may call the naturalism of a modern desert-journey has not such a dissolving effect on belief in the supernaturalism of the narrative of that

ancient one recorded in Exodus, as that matter-of-fact exploration of Palestine is even already having, to the fund for which so many pious souls have subscribed with hopes so wofully to be disappointed." Which, stripped of its verbiage, seems to mean that Exodus must be untrue, because Messrs. Buckle and Glennie were fed out of Crosse and Blackwell's tins instead of with manna—a sequence which does not in the least discompose the self-complacent *logique* of our author.

With Mr. Buckle Mr. Glennie is by no means wholly at one. Mr. Buckle believed strongly in immortality, on what his fellow-traveller rightly holds to be miserably insufficient grounds. "It must be a fact" (he said), "for if it were not true how could we stand up and live? It must be a fact; for if this forecast of the affections be a delusion, we must believe the purest and noblest elements of our nature conspire to deceive us." Precisely the same argument, as Mr. Glennie remarks, with which Uncle Tom convinces himself of the truth of Christianity; the same, in substance, as the Laureate's: "Like a man in wrath, the heart stands up and answers, 'I have felt;'" an argument, in fact, which sets forth more clearly than any other the radical weakness of emotional theology, the need of an authoritative standard to which emotions are to be referred, of an historic basis on which they are to be grounded.

Further, Mr. Glennie finds fault with Mr. Buckle for denying the influence of moral forces (as distinct from intellectual) on the character of nations—a matter on which we could not enter without lengthy reference to Mr. Buckle's book. Lastly, our author thinks Mr. Buckle far too hard on his countrymen—not in the way of stigmatising their illiberality (for, of course, he is heartily with Mr. Buckle in this), but of denying the existence of "an important liberal minority," and denying also the popular effect of Scotch sceptical literature, which, Mr. Buckle says, failed because the Scotch philosophers adopted the deductive method. All this is very entertaining; Mr. Glennie, a Celt of the Celts, makes good fight for his countrymen, though his views force him to call them intolerant, an epithet from which he takes off the edge by speaking of them as "logically Christian."

What we deeply regret is the way in which he permits himself to speak of our Holy Faith; now in plain cynical phrase, now in wild dithyrambs like those of the late Mr. Winwood Reade (see p. 155), he either throws Christianity to the winds, or, at best, "finds the mysteries of Osiris and of Dionysus not rising up in his mind to make him mock at Christianity, but to cause him more clearly to see the oneness of Humanity" (p. 307).

We are thankful to Mr. Glennie for bringing forcibly out that great upheaval of the human mind which took place in the 6th century, B.C.; but it does not follow that we should hold

Christianity to be just an after-wave in this tide of progress. Nor, believing in an historic Christianity, believing that Professor Lightfoot has shown the strict accuracy, even in trifles, of the orthodox way of looking at our sacred books, can we patiently listen to one who says: "Changed in the form of its expression, or wholly cast off as may be every doctrine of Christianity, untouched will remain the Cross of Christ; nay, even because of these changes and disappearances, shine forth with new meaning and glory" (p. 310). We deny that such a transformation is possible; Christianity must go, in spirit as well as in letter, if its historic basis is broken up. Under Mr. Glennie's new régime, what he pleases to style "the Cross," may remain, but there will be no Christ on it. Those who listen to him will find, too late, that he has taken away their Lord, and they will not know where he has laid Him. But, at least, Mr. Glennie might have kept clear of sheer palpable blasphemy; few who reach his 404th page will not shrink with horror from continuing in his company.

*Queen Mary, a Drama.* By Alfred Tennyson. Henry King and Co. 1875.

"POETS must not be second-rate," says Horace; "that is a fault which neither gods, nor men, nor booksellers forgive." Now it is treason to hint that the Laureate can be second-rate; but we do say that his drama will not add to his fame. To one whose *forte* lies in enhanced description; whose best passages often depend for their chief effect on what is something like a trick of words, the drama, in which so much is "understood," so much left to stage-play, must necessarily be unfavourable. Some, no doubt, of Mr. Tennyson's poems are, like *The Princess*, more or less dramatic in form; but that is a very different thing from being confined to the stage-dialogue, the meagreness of which no amount of stage-directions can fill out. Indeed, in a play, Mr. Tennyson's special excellence has told against him. Though he has crowded his stage with more than forty characters, and thus is tempted to hurry on the action, and to bring matters down to the level of ordinary life; yet here and there he still becomes over-rhetorical, and therefore feeble. Cardinal Pole occasionally talks too much; and so, certainly, does Sir Thomas White, Lord Mayor, the Queen's sturdy defender against Wyatt. The catastrophe of the play is Mary's total collapse, and her transition from intense love to hate, when at last the truth of Philip's coldness is forced upon her. This amiable husband, who, in answer to her passionate appeal that he should stay one day longer, replies—

"Madam, a day may sink or save a realm,"

and who only consents to stay because Renard persuades him to do so, cutting short Mary's rejoicing thankfulness, with cold commonplace, at last succeeds in destroying even such affection as hers. Indeed, there is quite enough in his conduct to account for the change which has come over her when in her dying frenzy she exclaims :—

"Open his heart, so that he have one—  
You will find Philip only, policy, policy—  
Ay, worse than that,—not one hour true to me!  
Adulterous to the very heart of hell."

Then borrowing a knife from her lady-in-waiting, she cries—

"This Philip shall not  
Stare in upon me in my haggardness;  
Old, miserable, diseased,  
Incapable of children! Come thou down.

*[Cuts out the picture and throws it down.]*

Lie there. (*Wails*). O God, I have kill'd my Philip."

But, though true to history, this reserving of the final change of feeling till the last diminishes the opportunities of setting forth that subtle play of feeling, that strange versatility of human nature, which it is the triumph of poetry to depict. Mary's character is too simple for anything of this kind. She moves along a certain groove, never swerving to either hand. Narrow, but intense, she has three absorbing passions: her faith, for the sake of which she sets up stake and faggot, her only fear at the last being that she had not done enough :—

"O God! I have been too slack, too slack;  
Nobles we dared not touch. We have but burnt  
The heretic priest, workmen, women, and children;"

her reverence for her mother, leading to something very like hatred for her father, and of course influencing her feeling toward Elizabeth; and, far the strongest of all, her love for the worthless Philip, whom she obstinately trusts in spite of all that she hears of his foul lewdness, and of all that she experiences of his brutal coldness. It is only at the last, almost in her death agony, that she is forced to give Philip up; and then the wrench is too much; nature collapses under it. Such devotion, had it been lavished on a worthy object, would have led and kept her right. She might have been led by one whom she loved; and, had she and Pole come together, he would have done much to lead her right, while she would have supplied the element of firmness which was wanting in him who "had the Plantagenet face" (as Gardiner says) "but a weak mouth, and indeterminate."



She, on the other hand, is never wanting in resolution. During the younger Wyatt's rising, she says,—

“ ‘Hark, there is battle at the palace gates,  
And I will out upon the gallery!’  
‘No, no, your Grace (cry the ladies); see there the arrows flying.  
‘I am Harry's daughter, Tudor, and not fear.’”

she replies.

Pole, by the way, is the only character which has any dramatic breadth; the others are sadly wooden. Pole does change; coming into England as a peace-maker, he is partly driven to persecute by Gardiner's malignant reference to his own “broad” views when he was in Italy, partly wheedled into acquiescence by the united efforts of Philip and Mary. By-and-by, Pope Caraffa strips him of his legateship, and cites him to Rome for heresy. The most pathetic passage in the play is that (act v. sc. ii.) where Mary, striving to comfort her cousin under this crushing blow, reminds him how, long before,

“It was thought we two  
Might make one flesh, and cleave unto each other  
As man and wife.”

There is a wonderful depth of sadness in his reply:—

“No; we were not made  
One flesh in happiness, no happiness here;  
But now we are made one flesh in misery;  
Our bridesmaids are not lovely—Disappointment,  
Ingratitude, Injustice, Evil-tongue,  
Labour-in-vain.”

Poor Mary! to have, instead of tender loving guidance like his, the treacherous craft of the Fleming Renard, and the cold disdain of her husband. True to history, though almost incredible, is the selfishness which, when the Queen begs for one day more of Philip's company—

“A day may save a heart from breaking too,”

and even Simon Renard advises him to stay, can prompt such a speech as this:—

“By St. James I do protest,  
Upon the faith and honour of a Spaniard,  
I am vastly grieved to leave your Majesty.  
*Simon, is supper ready?*”

More cruel still is his manner at their last parting. While he is muttering aside—

“Unalterably and pesteringly fond,”

he forces her to promise to make war against France (which loses her Calais) and to proclaim Elizabeth her heir.

"It must be done,"

he says.

"Then it is done; but you will stay your going  
Somewhat beyond your settled purpose.' 'No!'  
'What, not one day?' 'You beat upon the rock.'  
.... 'Do not seem so changed.  
Say go; but only say it lovingly.'  
'You do mistake. I am not one to change,  
I never loved you more.'"

And when the poor Queen is gone, her heartless husband turns to Count de Feria and opens to him his plan for marrying Elizabeth as soon as Mary is dead. And this is the man from her marriage with whom Mary anticipated such good to Christendom. We must quote the rhapsody with which she heralds the prospect of a son:

"He hath awaked! he hath awaked!  
He stirs within the darkness;  
Oh, Philip, husband! now thy love to mine  
Will cling more close, and those bleak manners thaw,  
That make me shamed and tongue-tied in my love.  
The second Prince of Peace—  
The great unborn Defender of the Faith,  
Who will avenge me of mine enemies . . .  
His sceptre shall go forth from Ind to Ind!  
His sword shall hew the heretic peoples down!  
His faith shall clothe the world that will be his,  
Like universal air and sunshine! Open,  
Ye everlasting gates! The king is here!  
My star, my son.'"

This, too, is true to nature and to history. Indeed the character of Mary is admirably sustained, though (as we said) she is classical in her singleness of purpose, without the least touch of modern many-mindedness.

Elizabeth, never a pleasing character, is, in Mr. Tennyson's verse, exactly the Elizabeth of history. By the way, her having been spared speaks something for her sister or that sister's advisers. In most European countries she would, under like circumstances, have been infallibly put to death. Yet these advisers are hateful creatures. Gardiner's one redeeming point is his kindness to poor weak Courtenay, once his fellow-prisoner. He gives up, under pressure, his patriotic opposition to the Pope's absolute supremacy. Bonner has no redeeming point at all; and the worst of it is, that neither of them was a zealot. They had both trimmed and were ready to trim again. Gardiner's policy makes him anxious to stamp out heresy. Bonner is eager to burn out of petty revenge against those who imprisoned him.

Not the least remarkable feature in the play is the multitude

of characters ; this will be a drawback to its being acted, while on the other hand the brisk action and the absence of very long speeches, fit it for being put on the stage. In this it contrasts strangely with *Bothwell*, that mass of elaborate orations, each longer than the one before it. *Queen Mary* is all the more like real life because of a certain want of dramatic cohesion. It is a series of scenes rather than a play. No doubt things do lead up to the end—the queen's disappointment about her child ; the increasing coldness of Philip ; his absence when, amid her serious illness, the news came that Calais is taken—all this prepares us for the catastrophe. Even the burning of Cranmer tells at the last ; he is one of those whom Mary sees in her delirium, and she is eager to persuade him—

"Sir, you were burnt for heresy, not for treason."

But yet (as we said) the play wants cohesion ; there is no central idea in it ; it is a description, in noble, truthful style, of a stirring time in English history, rather than a drama. But our readers will, no doubt, go to the book themselves. They will find that, though the Laureate has done better work than this, we can still say of his first effort in a new line, *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.

*English Portraits.* By C. A. Sainte-Beuve, of the French Academy. Selected and translated from the "Causeries de Lundi," with an Introductory Chapter on Sainte-Beuve's Life and Writings. Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1875.

FAR the most interesting part of this book is Sainte-Beuve's life. It is just the quiet, uneventful life of a literary man ; yet it points out so strikingly the difference between French and English literary society that no one can read it without profit. Sainte-Beuve began as a surgeon, but he soon found that literature was his vocation, and published in the *Paris Globe* a series of papers on French poetry of the sixteenth century. This drew him to that band of literary reformers of whom Victor Hugo was head, which had started with glorifying the middle ages, and flinging contempt on the classical school of the eighteenth century. With these French "Lakeists" he was for some time identified, the fascinations of Madame Victor Hugo helping to bind him to a school with which his tastes only united him in part. Indeed in later years he regretted that, instead of calmly criticising, he had put the seal of his approval to a great deal which to disenchanted eyes proved to be merely bombast. But he not only hailed the advent of the new school, he himself wrote poetry—*The Life, Poetry, and Thoughts of Joseph Delorme*, in 1829, and *Consolations* the year after ; indeed, his chief wish was to excel as a poet, and in

this he failed. To use John Stuart Mill's distinction, he was not one of those who see everything in poetry, but rather of those who see things in prose and translate them into poetry. He also wrote a novel, partly autobiographical; and before the year 1839 he completed a lengthy and exhaustive *History of Port-Royal*. But his talent was mainly critical, and the *Causeries de Lundi*, which for a long time appeared every Monday in the *Constitutionnel*, are his chief title to fame. Very different from the ordinary newspaper writer, he spent the greater part of the week in elaborating his articles. On Monday he chose his subject and dictated a rough outline of it, filling in the blanks with his own hand. And for twelve hours daily, from Monday to Thursday, he worked at this draft, revising, rewriting, denying himself to all visitors, not stirring out till evening. On Friday he read his papers over to Dr. Véron ("for the same reason," slyly adds his biographer, "for which Molière used to seek the verdict of his housekeeper," and, he might have added, for which Archdeacon Paley used to read his sermons to his old nurse). Then at last the article was put into type, though it had to pass at least one more searching revision before being pronounced ready for publication. Verily, whatever may have been Sainte-Beuve's talent, he excelled in what is sometimes held to be synonymous with talent—a capacity for taking pains.

These articles brought him £12 apiece—very little, if we consider their merit and the time and care bestowed upon them. He wrote besides for the *Moniteur*, the *Journal Officiel*, and (strange freak for a senator of the Second Empire) for the *Temps*, all his contributions being of sterling worth; though (owing to the French plan of signing articles, which acts as such a check on "slashing" writing,) they often want the directness of point which marks English criticism. Sainte-Beuve's political career went hand in hand with his literary achievements. In 1840 M. Cousin made him a keeper of the Mazarin library; and, during his keepership, he had a smoky chimney in his official rooms set right at the public expense. The cost of this was entered as "Sainte-Beuve, 100 francs," and, when Louis Philippe fell, in 1848, the item appeared in the *Revue Rétrospective*, a published list of all who "received bribes during the late reign." Instantly there was a howl; the "Tite-Barnacles" (as Dickens calls them) hereditary jobbers who cling to office, unshaken by any revolutions, were righteously indignant, and the clerical party, with the amiable Veuillot at their head, were glad of anything which "told against an unbeliever." Very foolishly, Sainte-Beuve (who had at first treated the affair as a silly joke) threw up his appointment and accepted the professorship of French literature at the University of Liege. He only stayed there a year, during which he lectured on Châteaubriand, mercilessly setting forth the shortcomings of his quondam hero.

It was not only in regard to the romantic school that his ideas underwent a change. He gradually cooled down in his opposition to the Empire, accepting in 1854 the post of Professor at the Normal School, and actually, in 1865, being nominated senator at a yearly salary of 30,000 francs. Of course his old associates cried "treason," and said that he had sold himself for a mess of pottage; and it is certainly hard to believe that a man of such discernment should have mistaken a charlatan like Louis Napoleon for "another Joseph II.," or should have thought that a nation can be well-governed by supplying it always with the *mot d'ordre*. Nevertheless, he was, for a senator, fairly independent. He combatted the press restrictions, even to the extent of quarrelling with his fellow-senators; he supported freedom of speculation; he defended the memory of Proudhon against unwarrantable attacks; and (as we said) insisted on writing for the *Temps*. His *Letters to the Princess Mathilde* enable us to judge on what intimate terms he was with the ex-imperial family; while the outcry that was raised because he gave a dinner to Prince Napoleon, About, Taine, and two or three more, on "what turned out to be Good Friday," shows the violence of the French clergy against all who do not court them. Happily for himself, Sainte-Beuve died in 1869, before the wretched collapse of the system with which he had become identified. He was not a great man; but he was a clever writer. The book before us (surely written by a Frenchman, some of the idioms are so un-English) deals wholly with his *Causeries*. It contains the life of Mary Queen of Scots, on whom Sainte-Beuve is almost as hard as Mr. Froude himself. He believes in the Casket-letters; in fact all he can say in extenuation is that "the part of Clytemnestra was not natural to her—was only forced on her by passion." Mary's behaviour in the closing scene of her life impresses him more strongly than it does most Englishmen, it actually "prevents any bygone stain from being seen except through tears." Next comes the life of Lord Chesterfield, then that of Franklin, who does not seem to have foreseen the French Revolution, though Lord Chesterfield years before predicted it. Gibbon and Cowper come next, and are followed by an interesting review of Taine's English Literature, with which Sainte-Beuve is far from agreeing, and which, in a closing essay on Pope's place as a poet he further criticises with much freedom and severity.

M. Taine thinks that the poet is the creature of his surroundings. The race to which he belongs, his position in the civilisation wherein he has been bred, the period at which he lived, and the circumstances in which he was placed, all modify his poetry. This is true; but it is not the whole truth. There is such a thing as originality; and through not sufficiently recognising this, M. Taine has laid himself open to his skilful antagonist. Of Pope

Sainte-Beuve's opinion is very high, and he shows by an elaborate criticism that the sickly little misshapen man was what he was in spite of and not by virtue of his surroundings. We are glad to think that the volume before us will introduce many English readers to an author who, however, is best read in the original. Much of the subtle flavour of Sainte-Beuve's writing must disappear under the very best translation, and this translation is strangely unequal.

*Cosmo de Medici: An Historical Tragedy and other Poems.*

By Richard Hengist Horne, Author of "Orion," &c.  
London: George Rivers, Aldine Chambers, Paternoster Row. 1875.

OF the two five-act tragedies which the author of *Orion* has contributed to the scanty array of contemporary legitimate high-dramas, we should, on the whole, award a preference to that masterly treatment of the terrible domestic tragedy of Duke Cosmo and his sons, just laid before the reading public in a handsome "library" volume, uniform with the "library edition" of *Orion*, which we had the pleasure of noticing some little time since. A permanent and readable edition of Mr. Horne's poetic and dramatic works, published and unpublished, has long been a *desideratum*; and we are glad to see such a sign as the present, that the veteran poet is in case to use, with good effect for the public benefit, such leisure as may have accrued upon his hands since he received the honoured and honourable recognition of being placed upon Her Majesty's Civil List. If we mistake not, this is the first work he has issued since the distinction of a literary pension was conferred upon him: certainly it is a work of a very lofty order; and if the poet has, as it is rumoured, more such dramas in his portfolio, we shall be glad to see them encouraged into print by the reception of the present volume. A reprint of *Gregory VII.*, the second of the two tragedies above referred to, is also a thing much to be desired; for, if not so full of poetic impetuosity as the tragedy of *Cosmo de' Medici*, it is equally remarkable for originality of treatment and loftiness of thought, and, perhaps, even more remarkable for its technical construction as an actable drama. In this regard, *Cosmo* is, however, clearly irreproachable,—although its noble qualities as a chamber-piece render the reader liable to lose sight of its great practical merits, merits, indeed, almost unapproachable in any poetic drama of the day not written by Mr. Horne.

Doubtless our readers are familiar with the story of the Grand Duke Cosmo I., of Tuscany, who slew one son because the boy had slain his brother: indeed, the tragic story of Giovanni and Garcia is one wherein the attraction of repulsion is strongly exemplified; but from the dramatisation of the story in the bare

horror of the received version, the spirit naturally recoils. Mr. Horne, however, sees through the blood-stained records, and finds a more nobly tragic motive; and he leads Cosmo before us in the guise, not of ungovernable fury, but of stern Roman justice. The kernel of this motive, however, is in the conception that Cosmo slew his younger son under a conviction of guilt that did not exist, and discovered the boy's innocence when it was too late. The spiritual stature of Mr. Horne's Grand Duke is truly gigantic; and in proportion to this stature is the profound effect of his end. Recovered from the verge of insanity, only to depose in a premature grave the remnants of a broken grandeur, he comes before us, at the last, with his strong and terrible lineaments softened and weakened by the knowledge that his own hand has cut off, and for no real crime, the last hope of bequeathing the great name he has made,—that his best-loved son Giovanni had been the aggressor, while Garcia had acted on the defensive, and that his Duchess has sunk into the tomb under the weight of horror caused by these ghastly deaths.

Of the details of this tragedy it is difficult to speak in small limits, for one fine scene follows another so closely, from first to last, as to leave the reader little time for picking and choosing; and the lighter dialogue and movement of courtiers, artists, pirates, and others are as inimitably executed as the more terrible scenes,—such as the death of Giovanni, the execution of Garcia, and the subsequent meeting of the Duke and Duchess, and the revelation to Cosmo of the real circumstances of the fight. The few lines at the close of the second act are notable among many passages betraying a hand worthy to have worked with Webster, and yet not like the work of Webster's hand. The pirate Zacheo, who witnesses the fight between the princes, steals on to the stage (from which he has just stolen off), after the death of Giovanni and departure of Garcia, and, after reflecting on an unbayed impulse to part them, exclaims:—

“How sharp the wind sings thro’ the dead man’s teeth!  
And jars mine, too, as coldly! Shades on shades  
Creep o’er the quivering leaves. I almost fancy  
I see strange forms like Afrits and pale Ghouls,  
Dodge round the dark trunks, while the air seems filling  
With faces of men slain at sea, and those  
Who sand-graves found ashore! Away! ’twas written!”

But no idea of this noble work can be conveyed by detaching its finest passages; and we desist. The interest is intense and completely sustained, the style that thoroughly pure unaffected English, that scorns all tricks,—majestic and vivacious by turns, according to the situation,—the characters vivid, consistent, and tangible, the conception thoroughly original and fine, and the realisation complete.



The miscellaneous poems at the end of the volume are remarkably various, ranging from the thorough-bred British pluck of "Arctic Heroes" (in which Franklin and his first-lieutenant colloque on their situation amid the icebergs), through several keys of vigorous thought and delicate fancy, to the vivid and brilliant landscape-pencilling of such gems as "The Slave" and "The Plough." A blank-verse poem called "Pelters of Pyramids," written upon a highly-suggestive epigraph from Blake, we cannot do better than extract, as eminently characteristic. Blake's verse is the well-known quatrain—

"Nought loves another as itself,  
Nor venerates another so;  
Nor is it possible to thought,  
A greater than itself to know."

Mr. Horne's poem is as follows :—

"A shoal of idlers from a merchant craft  
Anchor'd off Alexandria, went ashore,  
And mounting asses in their headlong glee,  
Round Pompey's Pillar rode with hoots and taunts,—  
As men oft say, 'What art thou more than we?'  
Next in a boat they floated up the Nile,  
Singing and drinking, swearing senseless oaths,  
Shouting, and laughing most derisively  
At all majestic scenes. A bank they reach'd,  
And clambering up, play'd gambols among tombs;  
And in portentous ruins (through whose depths—  
The mighty twilight of departed Gods—  
Both sun and moon glanced furtive, as in awe)  
They hid, and whoop'd, and spat on sacred things.  
At length, beneath the blazing sun they lounged  
Near a great Pyramid. Awhile they stood  
With stupid stare, until resentment grew,  
In the recoil of meanness from the vast;  
And gathering stones, they with coarse oaths and jibes,  
(As they would say, 'What art thou more than we?')  
Pelted the Pyramid! But soon these men,  
Hot and exhausted, sat them down to drink—  
Wrangled, smoked, spat, and laughed, and drowsily  
Curs'd the bold Pyramid, and fell asleep.  
Night came :—a little sand went drifting by—  
And morn again was in the soft blue heavens.  
The broad slopes of the shining Pyramid  
Look'd down in their austere simplicity  
Upon the glistening silence of the sands  
Whereon no trace of mortal dust was seen."

This is quite in the lofty vein of contemplation one associates with the author of *Orion* and *The Great Peace-Maker*; and it is a model of simple, forcible diction. For melancholy sweetness of sound and sense, we should choose "The Water Mill," from which, however, we can only cull these few verses :—

"The grief-hair'd willows weep  
 Slow dews, like tears of sleep,  
 And lost enchantments float by, silently;  
 Only a thrill around,  
 Seems often like a sound  
 Of whispers—trickling drops—and far-off sea.

"Athwart the distance dim,  
 Three magic cygnets swim,  
 With necks and wings unearthly in their motion:—  
 Like spirits, in their pride  
 And death-white shape, they glide  
 Now here—now there—dumb as our rapt emotion.

"The dripping wing and hum  
 Of water-insects come  
 At intervals—but unlike life or breath;  
 O'er moveless reeds and grass  
 Illusive visions pass:  
 Oblivion floats in undecaying death;

"A pallid flickering gleams  
 With soft clairvoyant dreams,  
 And steepers our sense in strangely-working charms;  
 While movelessly we lean,  
 United with the scene—  
 A trance that broods beneath o'er-marbled forms!"

The rich tones of these fervent stanzas are accompanied by an ease and grace and unaffectedness, most rare among the best poets of the day, and serve to inspire us with a longing for a more extended collection of Mr. Horne's "minor poems." One more extract, and we have done: the following short piece, entitled "The Laurel-Seed," is very felicitous and suggestive:—

"A Despot gazed on sun-set clouds  
 Then sank to sleep amidst the gleam; --  
 Forthwith, a myriad starving slaves  
 Must realise his lofty dream.

"Year upon year, all night and day,  
 They toil'd, they died—and were replaced;  
 At length, a marble fabric rose  
 With cloud-like domes and turrets graced.

"No anguish of those herds of slaves,  
 E'er shook one dome or wall asunder,  
 Nor wars of other mighty Kings,  
 Nor lustrous javelins of the thunder.

"One sunny morn a lonely bird,  
 Pass'd o'er, and dropt a laurel-seed:  
 The plant sprang up amidst the walls  
 Whose chinks were full of moss and weed.

"The laurel tree grew large and strong,  
 Its roots went searching deeply down;  
 It split the marble walls of Wrong,  
 And blossom'd o'er the Despot's crown.

"And in its boughs a nightingale  
Sings to those world-forgotten graves;  
And o'er its head a skylark's voice  
Consoles the spirits of the slaves."

We should not omit to mention that there is a portrait of Cosmo I., affixed as a frontispiece to this volume. This portrait is itself a work of art: it is admirably engraved by C. W. Sherborn, from a medallion in the British Museum. The face is very grand.

*Travels in Portugal.* By John Latouche. With Illustrations by the Right Hon. S. Sotheron Estcourt. London: Ward and Tyler, Warwick House, Paternoster Row.

MR. JOHN LATOUCHE does not seem to us to be quite such an amusing person as the author of a book of travels ought to be; and *Travels in Portugal* is a volume with a generally amateur air. We should say, in the absence of names, that our traveller was both an amateur traveller and an amateur author, and that the draughtsman to whose pencil he is indebted for his illustrations was an amateur draughtsman. But herein we reproach neither author nor artist; for the photographs from Portuguese pen and brush sketches are very pretty, and look accurate,—while the book is as good a book as travel readers are in the habit of getting by the dozen from Mr. Mudie's library, and smoking over till they go to sleep. Not being a venturesome book of travels, this one has no thrilling scenes; and, not being a philosopher, Mr. Latouche does not undertake to instruct the world on the place in history occupied by the country he has visited,—though the plea of having been there to see is sometimes deemed sufficient. Still, in the absence of such philosophic instruction and thrilling adventures, the volume is not unreadable or altogether uninteresting. The author recommends everyone who reads his book to proceed to the perusal of Lady Jackson's *Fair Lusitania*; we recommend everyone who has read Lady Jackson to read Mr. Latouche, and see which they like best. Readers who like to hear the impressions of ordinary open-eyed people, in passing through foreign lands, will be highly gratified with both books; but we cannot pledge more.

*The English Peasantry.* By Francis George Heath, Author of *The Romance of Peasant Life*. London: Frederick Warne and Co., Bedford Street, Covent Garden. New York: Scribner, Welford, and Armstrong. 1874.

WE had occasion some time since to commend to the notice of our readers a second edition of Mr. Heath's interesting little book,

*The Romance of Peasant Life.* The remarks which we then made as to the importance of the subject of agricultural labour, and of any work giving a serious and accurate statement of facts in this connexion, apply at least equally to the larger volume now before us, *The English Peasantry*. In this book the author has embodied portions of his former work; but additional branches of the wide subject have now been dealt with, fresh personal observations have been made and recounted, and the theme has been considered on a much larger scale than in *The Romance of Peasant Life*. The present volume opens with a very important statistical account of the conditions of peasant life in those parts of England which were visited by the Royal Commissioners of 1867 on the Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture. The seven volumes of the *genus* blue-book, which the Commissioners issued, have appeared to Mr. Heath to be quite out of the range of general reading; and in this respect his judgment is doubtless sound; for very few blue-books, even of moderate dimensions, ever get into the hands of the mass of readers whom it is desirable to instruct and move on subjects of national importance. He has therefore done wisely in obtaining from the Hon. E. Stanhope, one of the Commissioners of 1867, a summary of the facts dealt with at large in their reports, which summary has been worked up in the opening chapter referred to above. Mr. Heath has given an interesting account of the work of Canon Girdlestone in forwarding the emigration of agricultural labourers; and, convinced of the necessity for union among that class of workers, he details sympathetically the history of Mr. Joseph Arch, and the National Agricultural Labourers' Union. We are glad to note, further, in a book which is obviously, in the main, written with the view of benefiting the labourers of our rural districts, and which is likely to have some influence, that the author recognises the fact that the farmers also have their legitimate grievances: he believes in the need for legislation to secure the tenant-right of the farmers, and espouses that cause accordingly. Still, on the whole, we should have been glad to see him putting himself occasionally with fellow sympathy in the position of the farmer *as regards his labourers*: certainly the position of the labourers needs amelioration more urgently than that of the farmer does; but those who know anything of our rural districts, and the inner life of a farm-house, must be well aware that the farmer has much to endure from his labourers as well as from his landlord. Most books on social questions at issue take one side or the other, and must therefore be received *cum grano salis*; and Mr. Heath's volume is not exempt from the usual conditions of reformatory literature: his facts are no doubt trustworthy; but there are other highly relevant facts that might be set beside them with advantage. He has taken, happily, the weaker side, and that which most needs consideration; and his book deserves to be read

far and wide: the grain of salt to accompany that reading is simply, "In fighting against the peasant's wrongs, don't forget the farmer's."

*Recollections of a Tour made in Scotland, A.D. 1803.* By Dorothy Wordsworth. Edited by J. C. Shairp, LL.D., Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrew's. Second Edition. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1875.

THE books of which it can be fearlessly said that they are for the future as well as the present are comparatively few indeed; but Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journal* is certainly one of them. It was not strange that the preface to the second edition should be dated but two months later than that to the first; but to ordinary mortals not versed in the family secrets of the Wordsworths it must ever seem exceedingly strange that this beautiful record of a beautiful soul should have found its way into print in a complete form, only seventy-one years after the tour which it records took place, some quarter of a century after the poet whom it commemorates had finished his long and fruitful life, and nearly twenty years after Dorothy herself had passed away, at the good old age of four-score and three. The existence of such a journal has long been a familiar fact to the lovers of William Wordsworth's poetry: the extracts from it placed here and there at the heads of the "Memorials of a Tour in Scotland in 1803," and in particular the "Extract from the Journal of my Companion" placed before the "Address to Kilchurn Castle upon Loch Awe," are things at once memorable and remembered; and in the memoirs of Wordsworth by his nephew, the Bishop of Lincoln, there are passages from this *Journal* of sufficient importance to give the reader a very keen desire for the whole book, as it was left by that woman of wonderful devotedness to whom the world owes so much in regard to her influence on her brother's life and works. And now that the book is in the hands of all who choose to have it there, no true Wordsworthian, indeed, no man or woman of taste, can fail to find in it a work of exceptional interest and beauty. It is redolent throughout of that exquisite sensibility with which one has always credited Dorothy Wordsworth, judging merely from those passages from the *Journal* previously published, and from passages in Wordsworth's own writings,—especially from one passage to which Principal Shairp draws particular attention,—that note to the "Evening Voluntary" wherein he says his sister, when first she heard the voice of the sea from the high ground of the coast of Cumberland overlooking Whitehaven and the coast beyond it, and beheld the scene spread before her, burst into tears. And beyond this beautiful sensibility there is the

perfect naturalness and *insouciance* which admits of the record of events being made precisely as they impressed themselves on the fresh, receptive, and eminently healthful spirit of the writer. It is a book to read over and over again, if only for the pleasure derivable from it; but for such students as desire to understand thoroughly the development and direction of one of those master-minds that the realm of English poetry owned early in the present century, it cannot be too closely studied.

To compare it with another Journal, also of a six weeks' tour, written by the chosen and devoted companion of another poet of that splendid epoch, would be curious, if not very profitable; but in truth, we should not have thought of setting this work side by side with that remarkable little book produced jointly by Shelley and his second wife, had we not observed a somewhat arrogant claim put in by Principal Shairp for Wordsworth and Walter Scott to rank as "the two great poets of their time," with Shelley, Byron, and Coleridge all belonging to the same time. Walter Scott as a poet is simply "nowhere:" with Wordsworth the case is somewhat different, as the magnitude of his achievements and the grandeur of his cultivated intelligence might well be set in the balance against the higher lyric energy and more miraculous utterance of Coleridge,—against the harsh sincerity, faulty, artistic instincts, and yet magnificent powers of Byron. But to set this calm giant of intelligence, ever husbanding his resources, often prosing in verse, and doing now and again all that he possibly could to stifle the poet that was unquestionably in him, in competition with the flaming lyric impulses, the glorious self-devotion, the absolute and supreme and only faultless singer of modern times, is a sin against all true criticism such as it is not easy to realise, and, committed by the able editor of Dorothy Wordsworth's Journal, it is still less easy to condone or extenuate when realized. To like or dislike mediocre verse may be optional; but to ignore the claims of Shelley is a fatal symptom of ineptitude.

*Text-book of Botany, Morphological and Physiological.* By Julius Sachs, Professor of Botany in the University of Wurzburg. Translated and Annotated by Alfred W. Bennett, M.A., B.S.C. and F.L.S., Lecturer on Botany at St. Thomas's Hospital; assisted by W. T. Thiselton Dyer, M.A., B.S.C., F.L.S., sometime student of Christchurch, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1875.

THE appearance of Sachs's *Lehrbuch der Botanik* marked an important era in the history of botanical science; especially important to the few English students who sought to know more than could be learnt from the comparatively superficial text-books hitherto available to them. England has for many years past been woe-

fully behindhand in the study of vegetable physiology, though few countries have done more for the systematic study of the vegetable kingdom. The impetus given to this branch of inquiry by Linnæus nowhere continued to be more potent than in the land where Ray had already done so much to make botany a science. But it seems remarkable that the botanists of the same land in which Grew, at an early period, led the way in morphological studies, and at a later one the prince of morphological investigators, the late Robert Brown, attained his world-wide fame, should not have sustained the national reputation by diving below the surface of vegetable life instead of being content to make outward forms the chief objects of their study.

But what the later generation of English botanists have failed to do has been largely accomplished by those of France and Germany, and Professor Sachs' *Lehrbuch* is a compendious exhibition of the profundity of their researches. Himself an accomplished investigator, and thoroughly acquainted with what has been done by the countless Continental investigators in his favourite science, he has produced a monument of learning and industry that will ever constitute a landmark in the history of that science.

But unfortunately the knowledge of the German language is as yet limited to but few of the myriads of students who haunt woodland glades and mountain sides in search of their vegetable rarities. Hence to them Sachs' handbook was virtually a closed volume, or even worse. The exquisite and abundant illustrations only tantalized such students by showing them what a store-house the volume was of the precise information which they desired to possess; but it was, to them, the feast of Tantalus. Thanks to Messrs. Bennett and Dyer this is so no longer. They have produced an admirable translation of the original publication, with all its rich illustrations, and have further enriched it with much material drawn from the fourth edition of the German work which was passing through the press simultaneously with their own. Besides this, they have added numerous illustrative notes, which add materially to the value of the volume.

One of the great attractions of this publication is the merited prominence which it gives to the structure and physiology of the lower forms of plant life. In one of the last published of our British botanical manuals, these cryptogamic forms of vegetation only occupy about twenty out of eight hundred pages of matter; whilst in the volume under consideration, which contains about the same number of pages, above two hundred are exclusively devoted to the morphology of cryptogamic plants, besides a vast mass of matter illustrating the same interesting objects that is incorporated in the physiological portions of the volume. This is as it should be. The structure and physiology of these curious



plants has thrown a flood of light upon the history of the higher form.

The first number of this journal testified to the value we attached to the study of these cryptograms above twenty years ago, and we are glad to find that our appreciation of that study is now so extensively shared by others. The publication of Sachs' Handbook in an English dress will materially extend that appreciation, and we cordially recommend this excellent work to our readers as one that should find a place in every library.

*Liber Humanitatis.* A Series of Essays on Various Aspects of Spiritual and Social Life. By Dora Greenwell. Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1875.

*Sermons out of Church.* By the Author of "John Halifax." Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1875.

THESE two volumes are linked together not by virtue of their subjects, but their authors. We have in them illustrations of what cultivated women of this generation can do in one department of literature. Lady novel-writers abound; and we are glad to welcome lady essayists, especially when, combined with an intuitive perception of the subjects which woman is best qualified to handle, there is manifested unmistakeable ability thoughtfully and earnestly to grapple with them. The Essay is pre-eminently what a writer chooses to make it. There is little danger that the essay-writers of the nineteenth century will be condemned for following too closely in the lines Bacon laid down for his own guidance; and the word "essays" is now established among us to characterise a miscellaneous literature which increases upon our hands at a rate only surpassed by the ubiquitous novel. There is, then, a work in this direction which women are especially qualified to fulfil; the insight which proverbially belongs to the more emotional temperament, the receptive faculties which form an important constituent element of genius, and the opportunities for leisure and reflection, being alike advantages which most cultivated women possess, and which specially fit them for such work as is now before us.

Neither writer is unknown to the public. The authors of *Carmina Crucis* and *John Halifax* need no introduction; and we, therefore, say at once that the first of these books is metaphysical-religious, and the second social-religious, if such compound phrases can be supposed to carry with them an intimation of the tone which pervades these papers. In neither is religion paraded or prominent; in both it evidently so pervades the character and thoughts of the writers that it cannot be prevented from influencing the tone, whatever subject is handled.

Miss Greenwell's views in choosing her topics are best stated in her own words :—" I have endeavoured in these papers to bring forward under various aspects my own profound conviction that it does not become man to put asunder those that God has joined together; that things which we are accustomed to place in separation, almost in antagonism, as material or as spiritual, are linked in an inherent unity, and that their connection, which we are, as yet, unable to trace out clearly, is close, organic, vital, and inter-depending." The titles of the first four essays—" On the Dignity of the Human Body," " On the Connection between the Animal and Spiritual Nature in Man," " On the Relation between Natural and Supernatural Life," " On the Comparative Freedom of the Will"—will sufficiently show the field in which the principles above laid down are carried out. The treatment is not that of an original thinker, but the abounding quotations testify to varied reading, and there is evident in addition a sufficient appreciation of the subtleties of some of the subjects handled, and quiet, independent reflection worth recording and reading. Amongst lesser matters we must, however, protest against the author's unsparing use of italics, a method of emphasizing proverbially dear to the sex, and in this volume recurring at almost every page. The force which is gained by the occasional use of this device is lost by its too frequent repetition, and the reader who is at first arrested, becomes after a while wearied. As a specimen of matter and style, we give the following extract, which the reader may well, in his mind, compare with what another lady essayist of very different type has lately given us in her "Hopes of the Human Race":—

"It is certain that on all sides man, however chained by his bodily nature, and strictly limited by his rational, overlaps and overleans both, and *requires* the spiritual, he possesses with powers but finite, infinite desires—an *inborn capacity for infinity*. So may we assume that, on the other hand, the infinite requires the finite wherein to 'manifest itself,' and show forth its glory, and believe that the spiritual has need of the natural. How does Divinity itself gain by its contact with humanity in the sacred Person of Him who was at once the entirely beloved of the great Father of Spirits and the Desire of all nations,—of Him who was at once His Father's Son, tender and only beloved in the sight of His mother—His great, His erring mother, Nature, yet to be redeemed and justified in Him? How, then, shall not our humanity gain when the Spirit from on high shall be poured within it, and this without stint and without satiety, in the days when the strength of nature and the fulness of grace shall not so much meet as be joined together in the nearness of an inseparable contact? 'Man,' says Sir Thomas Browne, 'is a splendid animal.' He finds even now the bounds of his present habitation too narrow for him; he,

the careless prodigal, the unthrifty heir, has hung about his ruined hall pieces of tapestry, thronged with the forms of hero, of demigod, of peaceful, life-enjoying faun, of flying, vanishing nymph. He has yet his oriflamme, moth-eaten and discoloured, like that of ancient France, yet thick, like it, with the vestiges of ancient glory. Nor will he consent that its splendours shall be at any time hidden away and forgotten. He requires, to meet his very nature, an area wider than his nature affords. . . . Man can do without many things, but there are two which, in the present warm meridian of his collective existence, he will certainly not forego, whatever else he may acquire, whatever else dispense with: these two are the hope of a future life, the realisation of a present eternal God."—Pp. 63, et seq.

We consider decidedly the best essay in this book to be that entitled "An Inquiry as to how far the Spirit of Poetry is Alien, and how far Friendly, to that of Christianity," in which there are many things worth noting. The "common antagonism to whatever is merely worldly" in which Christianity and poetry "are agreed, and mutually aid and reinforce each other" is well pointed out; at the same time, "when we pass out of the region of the conventional into a broader kingdom, full at once of sweeter lures and of deeper snares than it knows of, we come to a sudden break. These two can no longer walk by the way together; if they are still akin, they are no longer kind; they are brethren, but they wrong each other,—brethren at variance and in deadly strife. The aim of Christianity, under its present condition, is to depress nature—that of poetry is to exalt and intensify it to the utmost."

"Poetry, even in its largest, fullest utterance, deals always with the concrete; so, too, does Christianity, and the tenderness of each love to human love and to human grief is infinite. But while Christianity, that 'most sovereign woundeherbe good,' as an old herbalist would describe it, 'for either an outward hurt or an inward wound' with 'gentle force solicit the dart' to draw it forth; poetry, whether in its better or vindictive, or in its tender and plaintive mood, drives in the dart of anguish still deeper."—Pp. 136, et seq.

We regret we cannot make further quotations from this essay, which is not only interesting to read, but most fruitful and suggestive; and we hope that in some future volume of essays Miss Greenwell will bring out what remains of a most interesting subject.

We have plenty of *Sermons out of Church*. The writer of these has already preached many in her pure and healthy stories, and we must own to preferring her medicine in the form in which she has hitherto for the most part administered it. A story "may find him who a sermon flies," and one who writes both stories and

sermons can hardly expect to excel equally in both departments. At the same time, there is enough of sound good sense and of insight into the true relation of things to make us welcome the volume before us. The following are some of the titles of the sermons: "The Sin of Self-Sacrifice," "How to Train up a Parent in the Way he should go," "My Brother's Keeper," and give fair indication of what we may expect in the volume. The point of view is not so distinctively religious as that of the *Liber Humanitatis*. Highest considerations are from time to time introduced, but the tone, for the most part, is morally didactic only, and the writer aims especially at analysing our generally received ethical code on the subject of social relationships, and pointing out where it is faulty or systematically neglected. Amid many excellences there are here and there indications of shallowness and conventionality that somewhat surprise us.

*A Primer of the English Constitution and Government, for the use of Colleges, Schools, and Private Students.* By Sheldon Amos, M.A., Professor of Jurisprudence, &c., &c. Second Edition. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1875.

PROFESSOR AMOS has produced a thoroughly useful and, we should say, trustworthy, hand-book, on a subject greatly in need of such treatment,—the English Constitution and Government; and we are glad to see that this excellent manual is already in its second edition. In this pocket volume of less than 250 pages, the student gets a lucid account of the technical position of the Sovereign, the two Houses of Parliament, and the Executive generally; he learns the various complicated, and highly important procedures of every governmental institution; and, by a little application, he can become acquainted with every item in the massive and strongly compacted bonds by which the whole body-politic of this ancient kingdom is knit together. With such a book as this at the disposal of teachers and students, there is no excuse for any boy or girl growing up without a full knowledge of the conditions of citizenship in all their details.

*Methodism in Macclesfield.* By Benjamin Smith: Author of "Climbing: a Manual for the Young;" "Sunshine in the Kitchen;" etc., etc. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 2, Castle Street, City Road. Sold at 66, Paternoster Row. 1875.

METHODISM in Macclesfield has been from the beginning characterised by a certain spirituality of tone and simplicity of aim, such as, taken in conjunction with the romantic incidents of its history,

well deserve the memorial it has received in the present volume. Local histories of Methodism are frequently bare outlines, giving no more idea of its struggles and achievements than a tourist's hand-book does of the glories which constantly burst upon his sight. But Mr. Smith shows no undue confidence in the success of this new production of his fertile pen when he invites his friends to "view this gallery of paintings, portrait and landscape, and to gather such pleasure and instruction as they can." He had a good theme, but the skill of a master appears in the handling and arrangement of the topics.

The whole story of the Roe family, for instance, is fraught with deep interest: it presents more than one example of the tenacity with which religious convictions were maintained in the face of the most determined opposition from those who should have been the first to cherish them. The gap left in Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers' biography is well filled by the historian, who gives us full accounts of the conversion and subsequent career of several of that eminent saint's relatives, of whom, in her diary, she gives us but passing glimpses.

The peculiar fraternisation—for we cannot call the relationship filial—between Methodism and the Church, signalised as it was by the admission of John Wesley to the pulpit of Christ-church, Macclesfield, at a time when he was shut out of all others, is also a remarkable feature. Such fraternisation, we are happy to know, has not died out to the present day. We well remember the eulogy pronounced in that church by its then incumbent on one of the Methodist worthies whom Mr. Smith describes, Thomas Brocklehurst, whose remains were brought there for burial, attended by a vast crowd of people of all denominations. And we observe that at the laying of the memorial stones of the new Trinity Chapel in 1874, the Vicar of St. Peter's united with Non-conforming ministers in congratulating the Methodists on the fresh starting-point thus reached in their history. Such friendly recognition of the true aims of Methodism would, if general, have preserved intact the original bonds which connect her with the Establishment; and the position of the Church of England in Macclesfield proves that it would have been in nowise detrimental to its interests. But the acceptance by the clergy, formally or virtually, of the dogma of apostolical succession is inconsistent with such an attitude; and it will be their fault, not that of Methodism, if the future should not be as the past.

Another significant fact to which attention is drawn by the author is that the first considerable enlargement of the borders of Methodism in Macclesfield dates from the period of that great revival which spread over various parts of the kingdom from the year 1760 onward. We doubt whether sufficient prominence has been given by the historians of Methodism to this great epoch in

her early annals. It was a time of deepened religious life, a time, as John Wesley says, of "the perfecting of the saints;" and, though not unaccompanied by some extravagances, it tended greatly to strengthen the hold of Methodism upon the public mind. It was followed in Macclesfield by the change of the centre of operations from "the room" to what was then deemed a beautiful and commodious "meeting-house,"—a place, however, of far less pretensions than the chapel erected in Sunderland Street in 1780. Already, however, Macclesfield could boast of a Methodist mayor in the person of young Mr. John Ryle, an ancestor of the Rev. J. C. Ryle, well-known for his widely-read religious tracts.

Of the progress of the cause from small to greater things, both in the town itself and in the immediate neighbourhood, of the long roll of honoured names that has adorned its history, of the many blessed victories over sin and death achieved through its instrumentality, it is not our place to treat here. Mr. Smith has, however, done the work worthily and well, and we trust the perusal of his book will awaken in many minds suitable reflections as to the responsibilities resting upon those whose spiritual ancestry was so noble as it is proved to have been by the samples here given.

*Insectivorous Plants.* By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., &c.  
London: John Murray. 1875.

MR. DARWIN has written no book of more real value, and displaying more accurate research, than this. The subject until very recently has been a most obscure one; but a most valuable series of facts has been discovered, pre-eminently by Mr. Darwin, but also by Dr. Mellichamp, Dr. Hooker, Mrs. Treat, and Dr. Bennett.

The distinction between plants and animals has never been held by Biologists to be very clear; but under the influence of research it has become gradually more cloudy, until now the last element of difference has melted away, for it can no longer be maintained that plants differ from animals in that the latter assimilate proteinaceous matter already organically prepared, while plants can produce protoplasm and maintain life from inorganic elements. It has recently been shown that animals of a lowly order belonging to the *Paramecia* can live, flourish, and rapidly multiply in a fluid composed only of mineral salts and tartrate of Ammonia,\* and therefore without the trace of albuminous or organic material; it is true that Professor Huxley believed he had discovered a slimy formless organism in the ooze of the Atlantic which he named "Bathybius," the vitality and animal nature of which he affirmed; this, from its utter dissociation from vegetable life at the bottom of the ocean, was supposed to have the power—otherwise

\* *Monthly Microscopical Journal*, Vol. xiii. p. 190.



only possessed by plants—of elaborating organic compounds out of inorganic materials. But we have maintained more than once in this journal that the Bathybius of Huxley was simply an invital slime resulting from the dissolution of the myriads of minute forms constantly dying and sinking to the bottom, as Professor Huxley now admits. Under the pressure of facts furnished by the scientific men on board the *Challenger* he sees that it is hopeless longer to seek to retain Bathybius in the "animal series." But the fact remains that animals have lived on inorganic elements; and now Mr. Darwin gives us a wonderful series of experiments which demonstrate that plants can and do appropriate and digest for their nutrition animal forms and organized substances. There does not now remain a single feature by which a definition of "Animal" can be given which will not include the vegetable.

The greater part of the book is taken up with the behaviour of a little plant known commonly as the Sun-dew (*Drosera rotundifolia*). It will be known to most readers that this plant grows in boggy soils; bearing from two to six leaves, which generally extend in a horizontal direction. The leaves are broader than long, and their whole surface is covered with gland-bearing filaments or "tentacles." These tentacles are long, and the glands at their extremities are surrounded by large drops of a clear viscid secretion, to which its name is due.

It has long been known that these leaves entrapped insects; but the reason of this was unknown, or merely guessed at. But by a series of researches extending over years, Mr. Darwin has discovered what he admirably details in this book, that the animals are taken by an apparatus specially prepared for that purpose: that the viscid fluid is a digestive fluid allied to pepsine in its action, and that by a process of true digestion the animals captured are assimilated to the building up of the structure of the plant. The process is remarkable. An insect alights, or creeps upon the glandular part of the leaf; something equivalent to sensation instantly ensues, the tentacles begin at once to curve over upon the imprisoned body and the process of digestion begins: this may last from one to seven days, when the tentacles re-expand and are once more ready to perform their functions. At first, indeed, Mr. Darwin believed, what Mrs. Treat still maintains, that the plant had a capacity almost equal to the sense of *taste*: for whilst it would quickly curve its tentacles over a minute piece of beef or mutton or any animal substance, it was quite inoperative when a piece of chalk or glass or any inorganic substance was laid upon it. This, however, is now by our author modified. He affirms after repeated experiments that the effect of inorganic substances upon the action of the tentacles is far less powerful, and that they very shortly release it from their embrace, but they do possess the power of irritation.



One of the marvels of the whole process is the extreme sensitiveness of the glands, and the communication which immediately takes place from tentacle to tentacle. If the gland of only *one* be touched, each of the others (numbering sometimes over 200) is aroused to action, and invariably turns its gland upon the spot from whence the communication of sensation arose: while if *two* glands be irritated at the same time, all the tentacles near each will turn to it; thus there will be *two* centres of operation on one leaf; and the precision of the tentacles in directing themselves to the point of irritation is remarkable—indeed, the idea suggested is that of a lowly organized animal of the class Actinozoa, seizing its prey. More surprising still is the intense susceptibility to irritation exhibited by the glands. Thus a small quantity of a perfectly impalpable powder shaken up in water, will by its slow precipitation, if a leaf be inserted in it, cause the inflection of all the tentacles. A particle of thread weighing less than the eight thousandth of a grain, and even a particle of human hair weighing less than the seventy-eight thousandth of a grain, are sufficient to transmit a motor impulse to cause a tentacle to sweep through an angle of over 180°. And yet this minute particle is laid on the surface of a *dense fluid* through which the impression has to pass to the gland. Anyone may discover for himself how far this sensitiveness surpasses that of some of the most sensitive parts of the human body: a piece of hair, for instance, the fiftieth of an inch—very much larger than the above—if laid on the tongue is perfectly unperceived. Indeed, Mrs. Treat affirms that a fly fastened half an inch away from the leaf of an American species (*D. jiliformis*) caused the leaves to bend towards it and reach it in less than an hour and a half. This Mr. Darwin has not confirmed; but the delicate susceptibility of the plant to irritation is proved by him to be astonishing in a very high degree: and this is rendered the more wonderful by the fact that rain-drops falling heavily upon the leaves produce no effect whatever.

Another fact of great moment clearly established is that the glands *absorb* what the fluid digests; and great changes may be seen with the microscope to have taken place in the enclosed protoplasm; while further evidence of true physiological action is seen in the fact that the fluid on the glands which have not been subject to irritation is neutral to tests for acid; while after irritation the fluid has a distinctly acid reaction; and Professor Frankland finds propionic, acetic, and butyric acids indicated. Thus we have in a plant a distinct and perfect digestive process and a motor apparatus specially for the seizure of prey.

What, however, exceeds in interest all the other facts in the volume is the result of Mr. Darwin's experiments with solutions of salts, acids, and poisons on the leaves. The series employed is

very large, the results in every case being of the utmost interest, and a comparison of these must afford profitable and suggestive facts to a generation of philosophical physiologists. Our space will only permit us to examine the results following from the employment of the salts of ammonia. Solutions were made so that it might be discovered what was the minutest quantity of the dissolved salt that would cause the inflection of the tentacles. It was found as a result that the *one-twenty-millionth* of a grain of the phosphate of ammonia had the effect, and as the salt contained 35.33 per cent. of water, the really efficient elements are reduced to *one-thirty-millionth* of a grain; yet this excited a distinct physiological action and led to a palpable motor impulse—every tentacle being inflected and sometimes the blade of the leaf itself being curved. This is only one of an immense series of experiments with various solutions, all yielding similar remarkable results. Surely we have here evidence of the physiological susceptibility of organisms to drugs which should be highly suggestive to the medical profession. Since the days of Hahnemann we have heard a great deal of controversy on the physiological action of poisons and drugs, and especially when administered in minute quantities. It is not a question which belongs to any system of medicine, but one materially affecting the whole philosophy of therapeutics. If the thirty-millionth of a grain of the *right drug* can produce so powerful a physiological effect upon the glands of *Drosera rotundifolia*, why may not similar physiological effects be produced on the organs of a horse or a man by approximately minute quantities? Surely it is a question for experiment. To found a system of medicine upon “infinitesimal doses” is simply absurd: but to ridicule or ignore the fact that minute quantities of drugs and poisons may have a powerful physiological effect on organs specially susceptible to their action, is, in the face of Mr. Darwin's facts, and indeed of many others, a more transcendent absurdity.

The remainder of the book is devoted to the consideration of similar powers possessed by other plants; all of which are full of the deepest interest. Especially is this the case with the plant of the genus *Utricularia* or Bladder-worts of our stagnant ponds and foul ditches. The fine needle-like leaves of this genus bear a number of bladder-like bodies of a minute size, at one end of these there is an opening armed with what appear like tentacles, and the whole appearance when slightly magnified is strangely near to some of the larger *entomostraca*, better known as “water-fleas,” common to our ditches and ponds; at the entrance to the bladder there is a valve which can only open inwards; by this means minute animals are able to enter but never to escape; and in these small sacs they die and decompose and nourish the plant. For it is a remarkable fact that there is no digestive fluid in the bladders,

and no true digestion; it is merely nourishment by decomposition. So we have here two opposite means of securing the same result; in the *Drosera* perfect sensitiveness and power of digestion when an object comes to the leaf; in the *utricularia*, no digestive apparatus proper, but a most perfect *trap* to lure and catch prey.

We put the book down, having derived from its perusal the most complete and unalloyed pleasure. It is as nearly perfect a treatise as we can imagine a book to be: but we fancy that in it Mr. Darwin has put a new and powerful difficulty in the way of his favourite hypothesis of the origin of species by natural selection. Consider the facts. The *Drosera rotundifolia* has an exquisite sensitiveness, power of secreting a digestive fluid, power of absorption in the glands, power of communicating sensation from tentacle to tentacle, and power of motion in the required direction by its tentacles. If all this came to the plant by the agency of natural selection—that is, by the survival of minute modifications, these modifications must have been *improvements*—that is, they must have aided the plant in the struggle for existence. Now the value of the *perfect* digestive apparatus to the plant is plain enough. It has a small root and derives but little nourishment from the soil: hence the nutriment supplied by the leaves is essential. But this is the question: of what possible advantage to the plant could the initial and progressive stages in the development of these organs of digestion have been? Nothing short of perfect digestion—perfect sensitiveness—perfect motive power could be of *any conceivable use*. It is the survival of variations that *at the time* serve the species, and which accumulate with accumulating advantage along a certain line, that makes a natural selection possible. But here we have a set of organic functions that could only be of use when perfect, and therefore run counter to the whole hypothesis.

*The Temperance Reformation and its Claims upon the Christian Church.* A Prize Essay. By the Rev. James Smith, M.A., Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, Tarland. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster-row. 1875.

THREE years ago, two gentlemen, whose names are not given, instructed Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton to offer two prizes, one of 250 guineas and one of 150 guineas, for the best and second-best essays, respectively, that might be written within a specified time on the above subject. The adjudicators were the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Calderwood, and the Rev. G. W. Olver, B.A. Eighty-six essays were submitted for examination to these gentlemen, by whom the first prize was unanimously awarded to the author of the present volume. It is, perhaps, the most compre-

hensive work ever published on this important subject, extending as it does over nearly four hundred octavo pages, all crowded with facts, figures, testimonies, arguments, and appeals that, one would think, must make some impression on at least the Christian portion of the public. Perhaps the darkest feature of the whole business is the feeling that matters cannot be mended, which seems to be the prevailing sentiment of society, whether it arises from indifference or despair. The author of this book has evidently found it easier to detail the symptoms of the disease than to prescribe the cure. Our own conviction is identical with his and that of the promoters of this competition, that it is high time the Christian Church aroused itself to consider its duty in this regard. It is perfectly true that if the Gospel were received and obeyed universally, this and every other form of evil would disappear. But so it may be said if the Queen's proclamation against vice and immorality were only sufficiently attended to, the whole paraphernalia of justice would only be required to celebrate year after year a maiden assize. But law and justice require to be administered, and, though in a different way, the forces of the spiritual kingdom must not only be cried up but put in action. Let no foolish fear that the grand old specific will be replaced by "another Gospel," hinder any from lending the aid of their influence and example to the "Temperance Reformation." The greatest evangelist of the last century would have been among the leaders of such a movement, and, as has often been said, the spiritual community he founded was the first temperance society.

Unless something be done to stay the ravages of strong drink, the future of the Church and of the nation is imperilled. What a frightful tale is told by the statistics of the drink traffic for the past year only,—£140,000,000 of direct expenditure and another £140,000,000 of indirect loss to the nation! The direct expenditure alone enough to extinguish the National Debt in less than six years, enough in one year to provide an army of 20,000 missionaries with an income of £350 per annum in perpetuity! All this expenditure employed in what is not only not necessary, but actually destructive of the physical stamina, social purity, and commercial and political greatness of the nation, in what is at once a source of helpless degradation to those who indulge in it, and a crippling burden as well as a dangerous snare to those who do not. As we ponder these terrible aggregates, and think of the scenes of misery, profligacy, lunacy, idleness, disease, and death itself, of which they are productive, we rub our eyes and ask ourselves whether we are really living in Christian England in the nineteenth century. America, whatever may be her faults, appears to be far ahead of us in regard to the sensitiveness of the national, or at least the Christian, conscience on this point. To

quote one testimony, "The Rev. Charles Beecher says that strong drink is so generally recognised to be 'of the world' in Christian circles, in America, that, though he lived all his life in ministerial society, he never saw wine on the dinner-table or side-board of a Christian family," and he says, further, "were I suddenly let down to an unknown American family circle with wine-decanter travelling round the table, and were asked, what is the character of this family? I should answer, 'One thing is evident: they do not belong to the Church; they are people of the world.'"

We are happy to learn that out of 50,000 clergymen and ministers in England, some 4,000 are professed abstainers. Of course the great majority of them are friendly to the cause, even though they do not publicly espouse it. But it is time neutrality were cast aside, and every nerve strained to avert a crisis more pressing and more perilous than the predicted coal famine, though that should verify the fears of our timidest alarmists. We are glad to see that the Wesleyan Conference is moving in this matter, and we trust Methodist people as a body will follow the signal given by some of their most active leaders "and haste to the rescue" of England from the gulf which threatens to swallow her up.

---

WE have also received from Mr. R. Dickinson, *The American Pulpit of the Day*. First Series. Forty-two sermons, by American preachers of various denominations. So far as a hurried inspection enables us to speak, these sermons are of very unequal merit. Our impression of the character of the American pulpit, derived from this and other sources, cannot be fully stated here, and we leave it for a future opportunity.

*God's Word through Preaching*. By John Hall, D.D., and *Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes*. By Richard S. Storrs, D.D. The former part of this volume, consisting of lectures delivered to students of the Yale Divinity School, contains many thoughts on preaching and hints to preachers, by which a sensible reader, more particularly a young minister, may profit.

*Dickinson's Theological Quarterly* aims at a high level of excellence, and fairly attains it. But are there no theologians and biblical scholars on this side the Atlantic whose contributions might be secured? The last number is wholly American.

FROM MESSRS. HODDER & STOUGHTON. *The Verity of Christ's Resurrection from the Dead*. *An Appeal to the Common Sense of the People*. By Thomas Cooper. Like all the author's productions, this little book is vigorous, plain-spoken, easy to be understood. The substance of it has been delivered in the form of lectures to-

the working-classes in almost every important town of England and Scotland. We doubt if there has been a man in our time better fitted by shrewdness, geniality, power of homely, telling speech, and knowledge of the subject, to fight the battle with scepticism among the masses of the people.

*Four Years' Campaign in India.* By William Taylor. Readers of "California Taylor's" previous volumes will be glad of another, which, in many respects, surpasses in interest all its predecessors. It is a record of strong faith, of unswerving devotion to one great work, and of signal success in bringing sinners to Christ.

*Selina's Story.* A Poem. By the Author of "The White Cross and Dove of Pearls." It seemed to the author "that the idyll of a woman's heart had not as yet been sung, save in snatches; while the earnest questionings which belong to the inner life of man, the inexplicable yearnings which trouble all ardent human souls, had not sounded their 'Give! give!' from her lips either in fiction or in song—'Aurora Leigh' being the glorious solitary exception." With all consideration for the poetic sensibility of the author—a sensibility in advance of her artistic power, as is, alas, the way with most of us—we fear we must say that the "idyll of a woman's heart" remains yet unsung, and that the solitude of "Aurora Leigh" is still unshared.

FROM THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE. *Memorials of Mrs. Elizabeth Shaw, for eighty-seven years a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.* By R. C. Barratt. Mrs. Shaw was a devout Cornish Methodist, much loved and honoured by those who witnessed any part of her long and saintly life. She lived to the remarkable age of ninety-nine years, and in extreme age was of a cheerful spirit, full of humility, thankfulness, and love.

FROM MESSRS. TRUBNER AND CO. *The Recent Origin of Man as Illustrated by Geology and the Modern Science of Pre-Historic Archaeology.* By James C. Southall. Illustrated. The vast antiquity claimed for man by the representatives of crude modern science, and wholly opposed to the Scriptural version of man's origin, is one of the most important topics upon which theology and science (so-called) are at issue; and we have, on more than one occasion, as behoves, stood up against the pretensions of those who claim the title of "science" for speculations of an unsafe kind and of an anti-biblical tendency. From across the Atlantic we hail a voluminous and careful treatise framed with the view of checking these very pretensions of speculation to rank as science, which we must ever regard as adverse to the interests of truth; and the author of this work (Mr. James C. Southall) deserves great praise for his careful and indefatigable examination of the vast array of facts adduced as evidence of the "antiquity" theory.

His work is not that of original research and discovery, but that of appraising the results of other men's researches, and settling, as far as in him lies, the value of other men's discoveries, genuine, or so-called; and he necessarily goes over so much ground as to give to his handsome volume of six hundred and odd pages a good deal of the character of a compilation. Still, work of this kind requires capacities of no mean order; and if Mr. Southall has not started any very original pleas against the admission of false claims, he has done very thoroughly, and at large, what others have done briefly and imperfectly; and his book should be read by all who care to form a fair judgment on the merits of the question of man's antiquity. His reading has been extensive and impartial; and this impartiality adds the greater weight to his finding, whichever way it may be. As we have already indicated, it is against the advocates of the vast antiquity theory, and in favour of revelation; and, while the author draws upon his antagonists for full details of most interesting facts concerning the doings of man in pre-historic times, he makes it his business to demonstrate that those facts have not the bearing that his antagonists claim for them. The volume is rendered attractive by good illustrations, and made easy of reference by an excellent index.

FROM THE EDINBURGH PUBLISHING COMPANY. *Lost Footsteps*. Poems by Walter Sweetman, B.A. Long, dreary, blank-verse dramas, in which antediluvian heroes and heroines converse at a length which only antediluvian longevity could allow. The writer is a Roman Catholic, who seeks to combat atheistic philosophy, and serve the cause of Christian faith. He says "the masses of men will not read theological essays, but they will read tales or poems." Perhaps so, but not, we fear, such tales and poems as these, which we should find heavier reading than the toughest theological essays we have met with. The preface shows that Mr. Sweetman is not quite at rest on the Infallibility question:—"It is rather startling to find gentlemen in the highest, and in many ways most worthily in the highest, literary position amongst us, putting forward, in these days, that teaching of the deposing power of the Popes, against which many of us have, under all proper sanction, taken the most solemn oaths, and against which the Catholic Universities consulted before Emancipation, decided, as I believe, without a single exception."